DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 328 470 SO 021 022

AUTHOR Gromada, Thaddeus V.
TITLE The New Jersey Governor's Commission on Eastern European and Captive Nation History Report.
INSTITUTION New Jersey Governor's Office, Trenton.
PUB DATE Jul 89
NOTE 48p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Area Studies; Curriculum Development; *Curriculum Evaluation; *European History; Foreign Countries; Foreign Culture; *History Instruction; Intermediate Grades; Public Schools; Secondary Education; Social Studies; State Standards; *State Surveys; Textbook Content; *Textbook Evaluation; World History
IDENTIFIERS *Europe (East); *New Jersey

ABSTRACT

This document is the report of a commission appointed by the Governor of New Jersey to examine the status of Eastern European studies in the state's public schools. The commission surveyed the state's secondary schools and found that the Eastern European region outside of Russia was given very little attention. As its main focus, the commission appraised and evaluated 17 textbooks as to their treatment of Eastern Europe. From its analysis, the commission concluded that inadequate and inaccurate coverage was given to the history and culture of Eastern Europe. The commission made 12 recommendations based on its evaluation, including the creation of state guidelines emphasizing the importance of the Eastern European region, making grants available for the development of curriculum materials and other educational resources, and providing teacher training to give sufficient attention to the history and culture of Eastern Europe. The appendixes include a list of the textbooks examined and the survey instrument. (DB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED328470

Report of the New Jersey Governor's Commission on Eastern European and Captive Nation History

to

Governor Thomas H. Kean

and

Dr. Saul Cooperman
Commissioner of Education

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

THADDEUS V. GROMADA

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

July, 1989

SO 021 022

REPORT OF THE NEW JERSEY GOVERNOR'S COMMISSION ON EASTERN EUROPEAN AND CAPTIVE NATION HISTORY

to

Governor Thomas H. Kean

and

Dr. Saul Cooperman
Commissioner of Educataion

Presented by

Thaddeus V. Gromada, Ph.D.
Chairman, Governor's Commission

Written by

Thaddeus V. Gromada, Ph.D.
Professor of History, Jersey City State College
Chairman, Governor's commission

July, 1989

CONTENTS

	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. COMPOSITION AND ORGANIZATION OF THE COMMISSION	1
III. SURVEY OF EAST EUROPEAN STUDIES IN THE SCHOOLS OF NEW JERSEY	4
IV. APPRAISAL AND EVALUATION OF TEXTBOOKS	12
V. SPECIAL EVENTS AND ACTIVITIES	28
VI. RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE GOVERNOR'S COMMISSION OF EASTERN EUROPEAN AND CAPTIVE NATION HISTORY	30

APPENDICES

1.	The Governor's Executive Order No. 69	32
2.	Letter from the Executive Secretary of the American Association for the Advancement of Slavic Studies (AAASS)	34
3.	List of seventeen social studies textbooks widely used in the secondary schools of New Jersey	35
4.	Copy of questionnaire and cover letter sent to the Chief School Administrators	37
5.	Remarks of Governor Thomas H. Kean delivered at the Eastern European Studies Conference held at the Busch Campus of Rutgers University, April 15, 1986	39
6.	Program of the Conference on East European Studies in American Education sponsored by the Commission at the Busch Campus center, Rutgers University	41

REPORT OF THE GOVERNOR'S COMMISSION ON

EASTERN EUROPEAN AND CAPTIVE NATION HISTORY

I. INTRODUCTION

Governor Thomas H. Kean issued an Executive Order No.69 dated April 10, 1984, announcing the establishment of a "Governor's Commission on Eastern European and Captive Nation History". (See Appendix 1) Clearly, Governor Kean was responding to a mounting concern expressed by many New Jersey citizens, especially those of Eastern European ancestry who number over 1.25 million persons, that East European studies were inadequate in the schools of New Jersey. He declared in the Executive Order that "representatives of the people of Eastern Europe...have indicated that their history as presented in the public school curriculums is often inaccurate and misleading." The Governor, therefore, "directed" and "ordered" that "it shall be the duty of the Governor's commission...to conduct a thorough study of public school curriculum, including textbooks and all other pertinent materials dealing with the history of the people of Eastern Europe, various nations existing within the Soviet Union,...and to examine such materials for veracity and historical accuracy. In the course of its study, the commission shall determine whether the history of these people is fairly and accurately presented in our public schools and their curriculum."

The core mission of this commission was thus explicitly defined by the Governor. In a press release dated April 11, 1984, the Governor is further quoted, "Just as we have taken steps to assure that the history of the Holocaust is taught in our public schools, so must we take steps to assure that the history of the captive nations is taught as well. The story of the millions of people living under Soviet oppression must be told as part of history and it must be told accurately."

The Governor's order also stated that the commission will comprise a chairperson to be appointed by the Governor, the Commissioner of Education or his designee, the director of the Office of Ethnic Affairs within the Department of State or his designee, and other persons representing various ethnic groups. The commission was charged with the task of preparing a report of its findings to the Governor and the State Board of Education with recommendations it deems appropriate. This report has been prepared in response to his charge. In view of the recent extraordinary events in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe, this report could not have come at a more opportune time.

II. COMPOSITION AND ORGANIZATION OF THE COMMISSION

Although the Governor's Executive Order No.69 was issued in April, 1984, it was not until August 30, 1984, that appointments to the commission were announced. Thaddeus V. Gromada, Professor of History at Jersey City State College and Secretary General of the Polish Institute of Arts and Sciences of America, was appointed chairperson of the commission. The following persons were appointed members of the commission:

Roland A. Alum, Jr., of West New York (Coordinator, Small Business Programs, State of N.J., Department of Treasury)

Dr. Francis A. Baran of Milltown (Assistant Director, Research and Sponsored Programs, Rutgers University, New Brunswick)

Dr. Sol Chaneles (inactive) of New York City (Chairman, Department of Criminal Justice, Rutgers University)

Dr. Laszlo Feketekuty of North Brunswick (Private docent, Hungarian-American)

Janis Gaigulis of Hackettstown (Executive Director, Association for the Advancement of Baltic Studies)

Dr. Thaddeus V. Gromada of Allamuchy (Professor of History, Jersey City State College)

Dr. Vitaut Kipel of Rutherford (New York Public Library, ret.)

Alexander Krenicki of Passaic (Director of Career and Continuing Education, Passaic Public Schools)

Dr. Arno Liivak of Moorestown (Associate Dean, Rutgers University School of Law, Camden)

Daniel Marchishin of Bound Brook (Americans for Human Rights in Ukraine and Serbian Historical Society, "Njegosh")

Demetrius Dvoichenko-Markov of West Long Branch (Associate Professor of History and Russian, Monmouth College)

Zenon Onufryk (inactive) of Flanders

Dr. Janet S. Pollak of Riverdale (Associate Professor of Anthropology, William Paterson College of New Jersey)

Iskar Shumanov of Highland Park (Editor, Free and Independent Bulgaria)

Juhan Simonson of Lakewood (Director, Office of Ethnic Affairs, N.J. Department of State) (ex-officio from January, 1987)

Dr. Jack J. Stukas of Watchung (Professor Emeritus, Seton Hall University)

T. Robert Zochowski, Esq., of Princeton Junction (Director, Office of Ethnic Affairs, N.J. Department of State) (ex-officio to January, 1987)

The commissioners were drawn from the following ethnic communities: Bulgarian-American, Byelorussian-American, Cuban-American, Estonian-American, Hungarian-American, Latvian-American, Lithuanian-American, Polish-American, Slovak-American, and Ukrainian-American.

Mr. W. Randolph Schaeffer, manager of the Operations Unit, Division of General Academic Education, was designated by the Commissioner of Education, Dr. Saul Cooperman, as his representative and the liaison between the commission and the Department of Education. Mr. Schaeffer was also selected to function as the secretary of the Commission. T. Robert Zochowski, director of the Office of Ethnic Affairs, was an ex-officio member of the commission until his departure from that office in January, 1987. He was replaced by Juhan Simonson, who became the new director of the Office of Ethnic Affairs.

From January, 1985, to September, 1987, the commission met on a regular basis at monthly intervals with the exception of summer months. Almost all the meetings were held in the Governor's Room, State of New Jersey Building, 1100 Raymond Boulevard in Newark.

The commissioners were fully conscious of the fact that Governor Kean had created a commission that was the first of its kind in the nation. Thus, the members of the commission had been presented with both an opportunity and a special responsibility to perform their task well so that New Jersey could serve as a model nationwide and help expand and improve East European studies. The commission fully shares Governor Kean's commitment to excellence in education and understands that the underlying reason for its existence is to advance that noble cause.

The American Association for the Advancement of Slavic Studies (AAASS), which is based at Stanford University, became immediately interested in the commission. As early as November 2, 1984, Dr. Gromada was invited to discuss the plans of the commission at a meeting of the Board of Directors of the AAASS held at its National Convention in the Vista International Hotel, New York City. The meeting was also attended by representatives of the Kennan Institute and the Joint Committee for East European Studies in Washington, D.C. The Executive Secretary of the AAASS, Dr. Dorothy Atkinson, wrote to the commission chairman, "We look to you to learn more about the commission's work and hope to discuss how it might serve as a model nationwide to help expand and improve upon East European studies in the United States public educational system". (Appendix 2)

The commission realized that it was embarking on a difficult pioneer project, one without precedent. It could count primarily on its own energies and resources to create its own model. Above all, the commission tried to do its best.

To organize the work of the commission, four working committees were formed, with chairpersons and committee members appointed by Dr. Gromada.

(1) The Curriculum and Textbook Committee was chaired by Dr. Gromada. It was composed of the following members: Dr. Baran, Dr. Dvoichenko-Markov, and Mr. W. Randolph Schaeffer. This committee was given the responsibility of surveying the secondary schools of New Jersey in order to determine the status of East European studies in the curriculum. Further, it was to identify and assess the most widely used textbooks in presenting the history and culture of Eastern Europe. The results of its work, which also included the work of other commissioners, will be given below.

(2) The Human Resources Committee was chaired by Janis Gaigulis; and its members included Iskar Shumanov, Dr. Jack Stukas, Roland Alum, Jr., and Dr. Gromada (ex officio). This committee was given the task of preparing a list of scholars and other experts who would be willing to serve as consultants, speakers, and resource persons in the schools of New Jersey. With the assistance of the American Association for the Advancement of Slavic Studies (AAASS), the Polish Institute of Arts and Sciences, and the Association for the Advancement of Baltic Studies, the committee was able to secure the names and addresses of persons in the field of East European studies. Questionnaires were sent out to gain more information and of course to get permission to include them in the commissions' "Human Resource Directory". The responses were computerized (data base) at the Department of Education, thanks to our liaison person, Mr. W. Randolph Schaeffer. A printed "Human Resources Directory" will be made available through the Department of Education upon request. This directory will list persons alphabetically according to their fields of specialization and also according to their ethnic background. In addition, a directory of resource organizations will also be made available to schools and interested groups.

(3) The Materials and Resources Committee was chaired by Dr. Vitaut Kipel; and its members included Dr. Laszlo Feketekuty, Dr. Arno Liivak, Dr. Dvoichenko-Markov, Dr. Janet Pollak, and Dr. Gromada (ex-officio). This committee was asked to identify significant and appropriate books, articles, and other educational materials in East European studies for use in the schools of New Jersey. The rich information accumulated by this committee will be submitted to the Department of Education with an urgent request to publish an "Annotated Listing of Educational Materials on Eastern European History and Culture" which can be used by teachers, as well as by students.

(4) The Awareness Committee was headed by Dr. Jack Stukas and composed of Alexander Krenicki, Daniel Marchishin, T. Robert Zochowski, and Dr. Gromada (ex-officio). This committee was given the task of making the public aware of the commission's efforts and activities. It was particularly active in informing the media, including the ethnic media, about the Conference on East European Studies in American Education held at Rutgers University on April 15, 1986, and the meeting with ethnic leaders held on November 14, 1987, in the State Library in Trenton.

In addition, a special Cuban/Latin American section, headed and directed by Roland A. Alum Jr., was established within the commission. Mr. Alum is a specialist on Cuba and Latin America. His main task was to focus on contemporary Cuba and bring out parallels and connections with Eastern European nations. Although obvious differences exist, the nations in both areas are governed by communist regimes kept in power by strong Soviet military and economic backing. A comparative study of communist-dominated countries is a worthwhile project to be encouraged in school curricula.

III. SURVEY OF EAST EUROPEAN STUDIES IN THE SCHOOLS OF NEW JERSEY

The commission determined that to fulfill the Governor's mandate, it was absolutely essential to prepare an appropriate questionnaire and to survey the New Jersey secondary schools from grades 6 to 12. Such a questionnaire was

prepared by the commission, along with a cover letter dated May 9, 1985, from Chairman Dr. Gromada to chief school administrators. By the end of May, 1985, 539 questionnaires were mailed out. Four hundred four of them were sent to public schools, and 135 went to private schools. Three hundred and fifty schools (65%) returned the questionnaires to Chairman Dr. Gromada at his Jersey City State College address by July 26, 1985. The returns of this questionnaire were used to identify the 17 most widely used social studies textbooks (see Appendix 3), which commission members then began to evaluate. Another slightly revised questionnaire and cover letter were prepared (see Appendix 4) with a return deadline of May 1, 1987. This time, out of 539 schools, 251 responded (46.5%).

The following Table 1 shows the number of secondary schools from each of New Jersey's 21 counties that participated in the 1987 survey:

County	Total Number	Number of Public Schools	Number of Private Schools
1. Atlantic	5	5	0
2. Bergen	39	37	2
3. Burlington	11	10	1
4. Camden	14	12	2
5. Cape May	5	5	0
6. Cumberland	5	5	0
7. Essex	15	13	2
8. Gloucester	12	11	1
9. Hudson	11	9	2
10. Hunterdon	3	3	0
11. Mercer	10	8	2
12. Middlesex	22	18	4
13. Monmouth	14	12	2
14. Morris	18	15	3
15. Ocean	14	12	2
16. Passaic	13	11	2
17. Salem	5	5	0
18. Somerset	13	9	4
19. Sussex	7	5	2
20. Union	13	12	1
21. Warren	2	2	0
Total	251	219	32

The tabulation of the responses found in this report were done under Dr. Gromada's supervision by a volunteer assistant, his sister Mrs. Jane Kedron, recently retired chair of the Modern Language Department of Northern Highlands Regional High School, Allendale, New Jersey.

Questionnaire Results

Question number one asked if schools had any provisions for studies in East European history and East European culture. Two hundred fifteen schools

(86%) indicated that they made provisions for the teaching of East European history, and only 36 schools (14%) said no provisions were made. As far as teaching about East European culture is concerned, 182 schools (72.5%) claimed they made provisions for it; and the rest, 69 schools (27.5%), did not.

A note about the commission's definition of Eastern Europe was included with the question to make it clear that Eastern Europe does not refer only to Russia. Nevertheless, further evidence from the questionnaire results will demonstrate that it is Russia that received most of the attention while the rest of Eastern Europe got little or no attention.

Question number two inquired if Eastern European studies is treated in a separate course or as a unit in an existing course.

Only 25 schools (10%) responded that they offered separate discrete courses on Eastern Europe. One hundred ninety-five schools (77%) indicated that they offered units on Eastern Europe. Thirty-three schools (13%) did not specify how they provided Eastern European studies. Some of the individual courses listed were: Eagle and the Bear (comparing the U.S. and U.S.S.R), Russian History, The Soviet Union, and China, Japan and Russia. It is clear that the small percentage of schools that offer discrete courses focus primarily on Russia or the Soviet Union.

A very significant study, Teaching About Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union in New Jersey Schools: A Study of Curriculum Guides, was written in manuscript form by Francis A. Baran, Ed.D. and Adam Scrupski, Ed.D. in June, 1984. This study was based on a doctoral dissertation written by Dr. Baran under the direction of Dr. Scrupski for the Graduate School of Education at Rutgers University. Dr. Baran, a member of this commission, studied the curricula of 67 New Jersey high schools (grades 9-12) and found that 11 school districts (16%) offered discrete courses on the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe. Nine schools (13%) offered courses on the Soviet Union exclusively. The other two covered non-Russian Eastern European countries "as their affairs impinge upon that (sic) of their larger neighbor."

Seventeen schools (25%) gave curricular attention to the Soviet Union and/or Eastern Europe on a "unit" or sub-course level in so-called "comparative and international courses" that included World Geography, Contemporary Political Affairs, Modern European History, Area Studies, and World Problems.

Seven schools (10%) offered units which by their title implied coverage of Eastern Europe, but only one district provided significant attention to two non-Russian Eastern European countries namely Poland and Czechoslovakia.

In the survey course category, Dr. Baran found that 30 school districts (45%) showed that they covered Eastern European countries and the Soviet Union. Dr. Baran, however, noted that "there was virtually no substantiation of this assertion found in the curriculum materials provided...." The curriculum materials indicated a plethora of materials on the U.S.S.R. and virtually none on any other East European country. Whatever limited attention was given to one or another dimension of Eastern Europe was given "invariably under the form of a sub-unit exclusively devoted to U.S.S.R."

So although close to 80% of the schools responding to the commission's survey declare that Eastern Europe is treated in units within existing courses, Dr. Baran's doctoral dissertation, which was so important to this survey, leads us to conclude that the Eastern European region outside of Russia is given very little attention in the secondary schools of New Jersey. Indications are that the situation is likely to be even worse in the primary schools.

Question number three concerns the subject areas where instruction in Eastern Europe supposedly takes place.

The following Table 2 shows: The Subject Areas Where Instruction in Eastern European Studies Takes Place in Descending Order.

World History	227 schools	90%
American History	222 schools	88%
Social Studies	182 schools	73%
European History	153 schools	61%
Geography	152 schools	61%
English Literature	34 schools	13.5%
Music	25 schools	10%
Art	16 schools	6.4%
Foreign Language	1 school	0.4%

The following Table 3 shows: The Grade Levels of Instruction in Eastern European Studies.

9th Grade	229 schools	91%
11th Grade	203 schools	81%
12th Grade	199 schools	79%
10th Grade	165 schools	66%
7th Grade	79 schools	31%
8th Grade	63 schools	25%
6th Grade	48 schools	19%

As might be expected, the survey shows that East European instruction is found most frequently in World History survey courses. Two hundred twenty-seven of the schools (90%) that responded offer World History courses: 51% of the schools (117) offer World History in the 9th grade; 18% (41 schools) in the 10th grade; 9% (21 schools) in the 12th grade; and 8% (19 schools) in the 11th grade. World History was also offered in the 6th grade in 10 schools (4%), in the 7th grade in 10 schools (4%), and in the 8th grade in 9 schools (3.5%). World History until recently has been an elective course, which meant that a high percentage of students were not exposed to Eastern European studies.

European History is another area where Eastern European studies are given attention. This, too, is an elective course that was offered in 153 schools (61%) that were surveyed. Eight schools offered European History courses: on the 6th grade level at two schools, on the 7th-grade level at five

schools, and on an 8th-grade level at one school. But the bulk of European History courses was given in high school: in 9th grade at 35 schools (23%), in 10th grade at 37 schools (24%), in 11th grade at 31 schools (20%), and in 12th grade at 42 schools (27%).

Social Studies courses in 182 schools (73%) reportedly treated Eastern European studies. These courses are distributed rather evenly from the 6th to 12th grades, but the exact nature of these courses is difficult to determine.

One hundred fifty-two schools (60.5%) offered Geography courses; only 50 of those schools (32%) taught Geography on the 10th-grade level or above. One hundred two schools (67%) gave the course in the lower 6th to 9th grades.

American History courses on the Senior High School level are courses that are mandated by the State of New Jersey and required for graduation from high school. Two hundred twenty-two schools (88%) reported that coverage was given to Eastern Europe in those courses. There is little doubt that this is the subject area where most students were exposed to Eastern Europe.

Obviously, Eastern Europe is covered in connection with American foreign policy during World War I and especially during World War II and the Cold War period. Such coverage although important is certainly not adequate for an understanding of this region. Besides, its main thrust is on bilateral American - Soviet relations and the struggle against communism.

The survey emphatically shows that the culture of Eastern Europe is badly neglected. Only 34 schools (14%) state that Eastern Europe receives some attention in Literature courses; only 16 schools (6.4%) give attention to Eastern Europe in Art courses, and 25 schools (10%) in Music courses. When one considers the rich contributions of East Europeans in the fields of music, literature, and art, then, it can be concluded that the students of New Jersey are being shortchanged.

In modern languages the situation is even more shocking. Only one school in Bergen county reported offering a Russian language course. The secondary schools in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe have a much better record in teaching English and West European languages. Considering that there is such a large percentage of New Jerseyeans of East European origin, it is surprising that schools have not made a greater effort to introduce Polish, Russian, Ukrainian, Slovak, and other East European languages into their curricula. In answer to one part of question number one, 182 schools (72.5%) claimed that provisions were made about the teaching of East European culture. Obviously, a discrepancy exists.

It would seem that a focus on the culture of East Europeans would be the best way of introducing American students to Eastern Europe. As the late historian from Dartmouth, Henry L. Roberts, put it, Eastern European studies need "More Bela Bartok" and "Less Bela Kun."

Question number four asked the schools to indicate the degree of attention given to individual East European countries in their curricula. The Eastern European countries were listed alphabetically from Albania to Yugoslavia, and

the respondents were asked to place the symbol + for a great deal of attention, V for some attention, or 0 for no attention next to countries listed. This was not a simple task to perform, and roughly 12 to 15% of the respondents did not answer the question. It may be that these respondents either did not want to take the time to make any assessment or else they felt that they had an insufficient basis for making a judgment.

As one might expect, the response to question number four (see table below) reveals that Russia of all the Eastern European countries receives the "lions share" of attention. One hundred sixty schools (66%) of those responding report that Russia receives "a great deal of attention" while 50 schools (20%) indicate that it receives "some attention." Only 3 schools say that Russia receives no attention.

Poland is a distant second to Russia since only 63 schools (25%) report that it is given a "great deal of attention" while 145 schools (57%) indicate it is given "some attention."

The table below shows that besides Russia, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and Yugoslavia are the East European countries receiving the most attention. But it must be remembered that with the exception of Poland (see below) the other countries receive "a great deal of attention" from less than 5% of the schools. However, 213 of the schools claim to give these countries at least "some attention." It would appear that the attention that is given to Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and Yugoslavia is largely due to their prominence in current events in the context of post-war Soviet-American Cold War tensions and the study of communism. East European countries that manage to make the headlines from time to time are likely to receive more attention in the curriculum than countries who do not.

Least attention is given to Eastern European countries in the Transcaucasian region (e.g., Azerbaijan, Armenia, and Georgia) and the Baltic region (e.g., Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia). In recent months, many of these countries have been making some headlines following the announcement of Gorbachev's "perestroika" and "glasnost" policies. So if a new survey were conducted, the results might be somewhat different. In general, Balkan countries (e.g., Albania and Moldavia) did not do too well although Romania and Bulgaria received some attention in almost 60% of the schools. Byelorussia received "no attention" in almost 60% of the schools while the Ukraine is totally ignored in almost one third of the schools. If the "no answers" were included, the picture would be bleaker.

Question number four was not meant to imply that every Eastern European country should receive an equal amount of attention. At the same time, the responses show that the disparity between the attention given to Russia and to the other Eastern European countries is much too great. This can only lead to a distorted view of history.

The following Table 4 shows: The Degree of Attention Given to Individual Eastern European Countries."

	Great Deal of Attention		Some Attention		No Attention		No Answer	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Russia	165	(66%)	50	(20%)	3	(1%)	33	(13%)
Poland	63	(25%)	145	(57%)	9	(3.6%)	34	(13.5%)
Czechoslovakia	34	(13.5%)	166	(66%)	14	(5%)	37	(14.7%)
Hungary	32	(12.7%)	170	(67.7%)	16	(6%)	33	(13%)
Yugoslavia	32	(12.7%)	165	(65.7%)	20	(8%)	34	(13.5%)
Ukraine	23	(9%)	124	(49%)	69	(27.9%)	35	(14%)
Romania	15	(6%)	148	(59%)	57	(22%)	31	(12.3%)
Georgia	7	(2.7%)	65	(25.8%)	146	(58%)	33	(13%)
Byelorussia	7	(2.7%)	64	(25%)	147	(58.5%)	33	(13%)
Latvia	6	(2.3%)	105	(42%)	106	(42%)	34	(13.5%)
Bulgaria	5	(2%)	139	(55%)	72	(28%)	35	(14%)
Lithuania	5	(2%)	120	(48%)	93	(37%)	33	(13%)
Estonia	4	(1.5%)	116	(46%)	99	(39.4%)	32	(12.7%)
Albania	4	(1.5%)	123	(49%)	84	(33%)	40	(15.9%)
Azerbaijan	1	(.3%)	39	(15%)	178	(71%)	33	(13%)
Moldavia	1	(.3%)	40	(16%)	176	(70%)	34	(13%)
Armenia	1	(.3%)	82	(32%)	136	(54%)	32	(12.7%)

With question number five, an effort was made to learn if attention is given in American History courses to mass immigration from Eastern Europe and to the contributions of Americans of Eastern European ancestry to American culture. It is known that persons of East European ancestry make up a significant percentage of New Jersey's population. Interestingly, only 21 schools (8.3%) answered that "substantial attention" was given; 134 schools (53%) said that they gave "adequate attention"; and 70 schools (28%) asserted that they gave "little attention." 26 schools (10%) gave "no attention."

In formulating question number six, the commission anticipated that the Department of Education was going to mandate a new course for high schools in the area of world history and/or global studies. So, it wished to find out if school districts were planning to introduce new units or courses in the field of Eastern European history and culture. Forty-nine schools (19.5%) answered yes, 169 schools (67%) answered no, and 33 schools (13%) gave no answer and can be presumed to be part of the negative responses. The percentage of negative responses is rather alarming.

Some of the changes anticipated by those responding positively are: 1) "a new unit in World History", 2) "a new unit in World Culture", 3) "Eastern European studies will most likely be infused in Global History Course", 4) "a new immigration unit". One school responded that its change will be based on the Department of Education World History/Cultures guidelines.

In question number seven, schools were given an opportunity to indicate if they desired assistance or information in implementing East European studies into their curricula in the future. It was encouraging to receive "yes" responses from 152 schools (61%). Sixty-four schools (25%) gave a flat "no " while 35 schools (14%) gave no response.

With question number eight, the commission wanted to learn what assistance or information was needed by the schools in the following areas: consultants, in-service training, curriculum guidelines, speakers, clearing house service from the State Department of Education, and others.

The following Table 5 shows the needs expressed by the schools:

Needs	Number of Schools	Percentage of Schools
Curriculum Guidelines	148	(59%)
Clearing House Services	75	(30%)
Speakers	58	(23%)
In-service Training	47	(19%)
Consultants	41	(16%)
Other	5	(2%)

Other needs mentioned were graduate level courses, AV materials, and bibliographical materials. Obviously, the schools are seeking concrete practical materials to assist their teachers. If these materials are produced and made available, they can be expected to advance Eastern European studies into the curriculum.

Question number nine provided room for comments. Naturally, these were too numerous to include here, but a sampling of typical comments follows:

1) "Very few of the present texts on the market include such units (on Eastern Europe)."

2) "It has taken me seven years to get a World History course into the curriculum and that comes only because the state is prepared to mandate it.

3) "I realize the importance of Eastern European studies, however, we can just put so much into a school."

4) "It is interesting that you still consider Armenia and Byelorussia countries (sic)."

5) "Eastern European History represents an identified weakness and concern. Any curriculum material would be appreciated."

6) "The survey is important. Please, however, remember that there are only so many school hours in a day. Choices must be made."

7) "The coming requirement of World History/Affairs will offer the chance to treat it (East Europe), but in depth treatment is virtually out of the question at the secondary level."

8) "Yours is a commendable concern. I wish you much success in the project."

9) "I think it is essential that our students have some background information on Eastern Europe, especially Russia.

Some of the comments above reflect the difficulties that must be surmounted if changes and reforms are to be introduced into the curricula of New Jersey schools. The questionnaire itself, however, has served to raise the consciousness of many educators and has stimulated them to think more seriously about the role and place of Eastern European studies in their schools.

IV. APPRAISAL AND EVALUATION OF TEXTBOOKS

The main focus of the Commission's work from the fall of 1985 to the summer of 1987 was the appraisal and evaluation of the seventeen textbooks identified from the first survey of the secondary schools. This turned out to be an enormous and time-consuming task. By October, 1985, the Department of Education was able to physically secure all the textbooks. In order to aid the commissioners in their evaluations, "criteria and guidelines" were formulated.

The commission began its work fully mindful of the first amendment to the Constitution which guarantees publishers the fundamental right and freedom to publish textbooks without governmental control. At the same time, the commission believes that the public has the right to assess educational materials and make recommendations for change. Quality of education depends a great deal on the educational tools (including textbooks) provided students. According to the former U.S. Under-Secretary of Education, Gary L. Bauer, 95 percent of high school reading is done from textbooks; and teachers rely very heavily on textbooks and textbook guidelines. "Clearly the information and the tone of information contained in the textbooks affects our young people greatly and should be a matter of great importance to us", Bauer pointed out at a conference sponsored by the commission on April 15, 1986, in Rutgers.

The commission has been encouraged by recent positive attitudes expressed in academia and by professional organizations about the need to examine textbooks critically. The American Federation of Teachers (AFT), together with Educational Excellence Network at Columbia University and Freedom House, sponsored the "Education For Democracy Project" which resulted in the publication of a book by Dr. Paul Gagnon (University of Massachusetts/Boston) entitled Democracy's Untold Story: What World History Textbooks Neglect (Washington, D.C., 1987). In the introduction, Dr. Gagnon wrote, "I assume we agree on three things. First, the teaching about democracy and its adventures is one of our most important tasks. Second, that teaching it well is difficult to do. Third, that one of our greatest obstacles to doing so is the weakness of our textbooks."

Dr. James Axtell (College of William and Mary) writing in the American Historical Review, Vol. 92, No. 3, June 1987, "Europeans, Indians, and the Age of Discovery in American History Textbooks" observed, "It would be difficult to overestimate the role played by textbooks in teaching of American History. Yet for some peculiar reason, textbooks are the only

products of historical scholarship that do not receive regular critical review..." Axtell further urged academic and publishing circles to reform American history textbooks.

What has also inspired the work of the commission is the knowledge that in the 1970s publishers and schools responded positively to the legitimate concerns expressed about the treatment and coverage given to blacks, Hispanics, American Indians, and women in textbooks and school curricula. (See Nathan Glazer & Reed Ueda. Ethnic Groups in History Textbooks (Washington, D.C. (1983)). There is, therefore, good reason to be optimistic about the call for fair treatment and reasonable coverage for East Europeans.

The following commissioners submitted critiques of the above-mentioned textbooks: Dr. Laszlo Feketekuty, Mr. Janis Gaigulis -- who arranged for the thoughtful, detailed textbook evaluations submitted by Professor Rein Taagepera of the University of California at Irvine, Dr. Thaddeus V. Gromada, Mr. Daniel Marchishin, Dr. Janet S. Pollak, Mr. Iskar Shumanov, Mr. Roland Alum, and Dr. Jack J. Stukas. Chairman Gromada synthesized the evaluations. He endeavored to include the most essential points and to organize them under the major topics and issues listed below.

BIAS AGAINST EASTERN EUROPE: PEJORATIVE REFERENCES

Many of the textbooks examined manifest a strong bias against Eastern European nations. Authors made frequent pejorative references by showing impatience and lack of sympathy and understanding with the diversity that exists in Eastern Europe and, in many cases, grossly exaggerating the pluralism and diversity in Eastern Europe. Small nation states of Western Europe are automatically given respect and legitimacy. No one questions the right of such small Western European nations as Belgium, Luxembourg, etc., to self-determination and statehood; but that is not the case for Eastern European countries. The tone of information found in the textbooks tends to discourage students from studying Eastern Europe by giving them the impression that it is unimportant and too much to cope with. Eastern Europe's cultural variety is described as a "crazy quilt of nationalities" (James & Davis, World Geography, p. 315). The Balkan peninsula is called a region that "contains hundreds of separate groups too small to set themselves up as nations." The region north of the Carpathians is described as "a bewildering multitude of people" (Marvin Perry, Man's Unfinished Journey, p. 416). Further, Perry (p. 53) states that Eastern Central Europe is a "patchwork quilt of ethnic groups often scattered helter skelter among each other."

UNRELIABLE BASIC CULTURAL, LINGUISTIC, AND ETHNOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

As Cyril Black puts it, "People of Eastern Europe are united by a common European heritage of Roman law and Christian faith, but there is an underlying division in the region that has been variously interpreted as West vs. East, Latin vs. Greek, Catholic vs. Orthodox." Eastern European peoples became members of the European community of nations when they accepted Christianity. Some of them accepted Christianity from the Greek East by way of Constantinople, and others from the Latin West by way of Rome. The

decision made a great difference in the development of the various Eastern European peoples. Their values, cultures, institutions, and traditions were deeply affected by that choice. Many authors, however, fail to make it clear which of the Eastern European nations came within the Latin Western Roman orbit (Poles, Czechs, Slovaks, Magyars, Croatians, Baltic peoples) and which came under the Eastern, Greek orbit with Constantinople as its center (Bulgars, Serbs, Russians, Ukrainians, Byelorussians, Romanians). These are fundamental facts that are necessary for the understanding of Eastern Europe. However, one author (Perry, Man's Unfinished Journey, p. 115) gives the reader the erroneous impression that all of Eastern Europe was influenced by Byzantium. "The Culture of Constantinople, thus served as a basis for the civilizations which developed in Russia and elsewhere in Eastern Europe. Byzantine missionaries gave the Russians and Slavic people of Eastern Europe an alphabet based on Greek." To begin with, Russians are also Slavic; however, not all Slavic people were Christianized by "Byzantine missionaries" and, therefore, do not use the Cyrillic alphabet. Poles, Czechs, Slovaks, Croats, and Slovenes are Slavic people, too; but they accepted Latin Christianity and use the Roman alphabet. To be more precise, the Bulgarians were the first to accept the Cyrillic alphabet after the death of St. Methodius (885 A.D.), and they became the chief transmitters of the Cyrillic alphabet and Eastern Christianity to other Slavs.

Chapter 2 in Burton Beer's World History: Patterns of Civilization is entitled "Eastern Europe: Heir to Byzantine Civilization." This is a false assertion especially since the author defines "Eastern Europe [as the region that] stretches from the Ural Mountains in the East to the Oder River in the West. It includes the lands lying between the Baltic Sea in the north and the Adriatic Sea in the South." Clearly, Poland, Lithuania, Hungary, Latvia, Estonia, Czechoslovakia, Croatia, and Slovenia are not heirs of the Byzantine Civilization. It is also incorrect to state as James and Davis did in World Geography (p. 325) that a "large part of Eastern Europe had a culture similar to Greater Russia." There are great cultural differences between Russians and other Eastern European people. Most non-Russian East Europeans do not have any affinity with Russian culture. Rather, they feel more kinship with Western European culture and identify with it. Even Orthodox Bulgaria, where some pro-Russian sentiments existed, could not be described as "very much like Russia before 1917 or as a land of "landowning aristocracy." This was simply not true.

Language is very important in determining the national identity of Eastern European people. Yet many authors are not very careful about supplying correct ethno-linguistic information. Linguistically, Eastern Europeans are a heterogeneous population. However, most Eastern Europeans speak languages that belong to the Slavic branch of the Indo-European linguistic family. The non-Slavic speaking people of Eastern Europe include Albanians, Romanians, Hungarians, Estonians, Lithuanians, and Latvians. Bulgars, Serbs, Macedonians, Croats, and Slovenes are classified as Southern Slavs; Poles, Czechs, and Slovaks as Western Slavs; and Russians, Ukrainians, and Byelorussians as Eastern Slavs. One book (James & Davis, World Geography, p. 327), however, groups the Russians with Letts and Lithuanians. Letts (Latvians) and Lithuanians are not Slavic people. They belong to the Baltic linguistic group. Danzer and Larson in World Geography (p. 453) use the term Balto-Slavic languages. Baltic and Slavic languages are two separate branches of the Indo-European language family. Wallbank (p. 554) refers to

"Sudetens and Austrians" as two distinct nationalities. Sudetens were in fact a German-speaking minority living in pre-World War II Czechoslovakia. James and Davis (p. 339) cite the Albanians as speaking an Indo-European language somewhat like Turkish. Turkish, in fact, is not an Indo-European language. Masurians, also, should not be listed as equivalent to "Germans, Swedes, Poles, and Lithuanians." (Perry, Man's Unfinished Journey, p. 417). Also, a careful distinction must be made between nations and ethnic groups. James and Davis in World Geography (p. 311) make an extraordinarily misleading assertion that the United States and the U.S.S.R. are similar because both have many ethnic groups. The Soviet Union is in fact a continuation of the Russian Empire which was multi-national in character. Many national groups became part of this empire as a result of Russian imperialism which dates back to the 16th century. The establishment of U.S.S.R. in 1922 recognized juridically the individuality of these various national groups by allowing the establishment of individual "Socialist Republics." Secession is even theoretically possible. These republics, which today number 15, are based on large national entities with indigeneous populations historically identified with a specific territory. These groups cannot be compared with the ethnic groups in the U.S. that are largely the result of voluntary immigration of individuals in the 19th and 20th centuries and have no aspiration of separate statehood.

Danzer and Larson in World Geography (p. 450) should not call the Ukrainians an ethnic group in the Soviet Union. Ukrainians constitute a nation within an empire. There is an Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic with a population of approximately 50 million that is officially represented in the General Assembly of the United Nations. It is outrageous for Bragdon and McCutchen to declare on page 607 that the "Ukraine is a region in Russia." Czechs and Slovaks should not be identified as the two major ethnic groups in Czechoslovakia, but rather as two co-equal nations that created the State of Czechoslovakia after World War I. Danzer and Larson (World Geography, p. 482) erroneously list Lithuanians and Latvians among the five largest Slavic ethnic groups, together with Russians, Ukrainians, and Byelorussians. Textbook authors should know that Lithuanians and Latvians are linguistically Baltic nations, whereas the three others are Slavic nations. Cooper in The World and Its People (p. 197) uses the preferred term of "nationalities" rather than "ethnic groups." But he confuses readers on page 202) when he declares that "Slavs are the largest ethnic group in Europe." Slavs are, however, the largest linguistic group in Europe. Perry in Man's Unfinished Journey (p. 417) incredibly lists Byelorussians, Great Russians, and Little Russians or Ukrainians as three subordinate branches of the Russian group. Instead, they should be listed as three separate but related nations classified as Eastern Slavs. Herbert Gross in World Geography (p. 320) refers to the people of Poland as "the Polish." A textbook author should know that the people of Poland are called Poles. (The singular is Pole.) The term "Polish" can be used only as an adjective and not as a noun, except when referring to the language.

THE PROBLEM OF KIEVAN RUS

Kievan Rus, created in 862 under Viking leadership, is identified by many authors as the first Russian state (Wallbank, History and Life, p. 80). It would be more correct to state that it was the first Eastern Slavic state

composed of Slavic tribes that were the ancestors of Ukrainians, Byelorussians, and Russians. Today. all three nations can legitimately claim their origins to Kievan Rus. Presently, Kiev is an Ukrainian city and a major center of Ukrainian culture. Modern Russia's evolution can be more directly traced to Moscow and the Muscovite principality of the 14th century. The word "Russia," introduced by Peter I, the Great, is derived from the word Rosiia and not from Rus. Roselle (p. 326) states more precisely that it is from "Muscovite Russia"--that "there gradually emerged one of the major nations of the world: that nation was Russia."

RUSSIA AND THE SOVIET UNION

Too many authors fail to make a clear distinction between Russia and the Soviet Union by using the terms synonymously. From the time of Peter I to 1917 one can properly refer to the Russian Empire, which was multi-national in character and in which Russians constituted slightly less than half of the population by the end of the 19th century. But after the 1917 Revolutions and Civil War, the communist rulers in 1922 restructured the Empire into the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, commonly referred to as the Soviet Union. The Russian Federated Socialist Republic is, however, the largest republic, and Russian national interests take precedence and dominate the Soviet Union. But at least half of the Soviet Union is composed of non-Russian people. Fifteen of these nations have been organized into distinct Soviet Socialist Republics, e.g., Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Armenian Soviet Socialist Republic, etc. These republics have a limited degree of cultural autonomy, but are often subjected to Russification pressures. Political autonomy is at best theoretical.

CONFUSION OVER NATIONS AND STATES

Students can easily be confused and misled by authors such as Wood, Gabriel, and Biller in America Its People and Values (p. 626) who assert that after World War I, "New nations were created out of lands taken away from the defeated nations as well as from Russia." Poland was mentioned as an example of a new nation created. Students must understand that treaties cannot create nations; they can create nation-states. History and culture develop nations. Poland, following the three partitions in the second half of the 18th century, no longer was an independent state; but the Polish nation continued to exist and develop its culture. The Polish state was recreated by Polish initiative, with the approval of the international community, an act that was considered to redress an historical injustice. U.S. President Woodrow Wilson, in formulating the 14 points as his blueprint for peace, devoted the 13th point to the "Re-establishment of an independent Polish state."

Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia should not be referred to as new nations (Wood, Gabriel & Biller, America Its People and Values, p. 626) created after World War I. Instead, they should be described as new states. Czechoslovakia was a new state created to fulfill the aspirations and interests of the Czech and Slovak nations while Yugoslavia was created to serve the southern Slavic nations, namely Serbians, Croatians, and Slovenians, that have a long history. Why do the authors rightfully stress that Germany "was forced to

return to France the rich lands of Alsace and Lorraine which Germany had taken from France in 1871," but there is no similar indication that Germany lost "other territories on its eastern border" which she (specifically Prussia) had taken away from Poland in the late 18th century? Germany did not have to give up any land to help create Czechoslovakia. Bohemia had been part of the Hapsburg Austrian Empire and never belonged to Germany. So it was Austria, as a result of the Treaty of St. Germain, that gave up Bohemia.

UNBALANCED COVERAGE: OVEREMPHASIS ON 20TH CENTURY, LACK OF COVERAGE OF EARLIER CENTURIES

Most textbook authors begin to take notice of the non-Russian East European nations only in the 20th century in connection with World War I and World War II and the peace settlements that followed. Students are thus given the impression that these are new nations that suddenly appeared on the historical stage out of nowhere. Wallbank, et al., wrote on page 563 that "Four empires had fallen apart in the course of World War I, the German, the Austro-Hungarian, the Ottoman and the Russian Empires....From the western portions of the Russian Empire came five new nations: Poland, Finland, Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia." This is a fallacious statement. Eastern European people have a long and illustrious history that goes back at least a thousand years. Many of them enjoyed long periods of independence, and some reached occasional greatness (for example, Bulgaria in the 9th and 10th centuries; Serbian Kingdom from the 12th and 14th centuries; Bohemia and Hungary in the 14th and 15th centuries; and the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth in the 15th and 16th centuries.)

It is misleading to associate Eastern European nations only with disasters and catastrophies. Eastern Europeans were not always victims and losers. Students must learn that nations have their "ups" and "downs." The most glaring example of this tendency is evident in the space devoted to the partitions of Poland in the second half of the 18th century that erased a major country from the map of Europe. James and Davis (World Geography, p. 327) wrote, "For thousands of years Poland has been squeezed, pushed this way and that, by the great powers on either side." This is of course an overstatement. Authors usually emphasize Poland's internal weaknesses in explaining its decline and fall. They, however, overlook the earlier centuries, especially the 16th century when the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth achieved greatness and brilliance. This Commonwealth (Rzecz Pospolita) was one of the very few examples in European history of a relatively successful multi-national federation in the history of Europe in which diverse people freely joined to create a more perfect union and provide a haven for religious minorities such as Jews and Unitarians. In contrast to Western European countries, there were no religious wars in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth in the 16th century.

Eastern European countries, in particular Poland, Lithuania, Bohemia, and Hungary, participated fully in the major European intellectual and cultural movements such as Scholasticism, Renaissance, Reformation, and the Enlightenment. This should be noted by textbook authors. Among the great centers of learning in Europe were universities founded in Eastern Europe, e.g., Prague 1348; Cracow 1364; Buda 1475; Vilna 1578; and Tartu (Dorpat) 1632. An alumnus of Cracow University in the late 15th century was no other

than Nicholas Copernicus. Jan Hus, a Bohemian religious reformer in the early 15th century, was the precursor of Martin Luther.

RUSSO-CENTRIC APPROACH TO EASTERN EUROPEAN HISTORY

When authors, at infrequent times, do mention the history of non-Russian Eastern European countries prior to the 20th century, they treat it as an afterthought to give a more complete understanding of the history of Russia. History cannot be written entirely from the perspective of the present, otherwise the sin of anachronism will inevitably follow. Prior to the 18th century, Russia, and more precisely Muscovy, was a secondary power that was not even considered to be part of the European community of nations. The Grand Design of Duc de Sully in the late 16th century did not include Muscovy. Many textbook authors seem to have a deterministic view of history, which implies that Russia was predestined to become the major power of Europe. Evidently, their approach tends to be Russo-centric and, therefore, contains a pro-Russian bias. Whatever was in the way of the "natural and inevitable" expansion of Russia seems to be considered a negative factor.

Mazour (Men and Nations: A World History, p. 262) writes that "In the late 1300s these two nations [Lithuania and Poland] united to form a kingdom (sic) that was usually unfriendly toward Russia." Of course, the obvious reverse statement is not made. Besides, the Kingdom of Poland and the Grand Duchy of Lithuania did not form a kingdom. Instead, a dynastic union was formed between the two political entities in 1386 when Jogaila (Jaqiello), the Grand Duke of Lithuania, married Jadwiga of Poland and became also the King of Poland. It was the common danger coming from the German Teutonic Order that brought Poland and Lithuania together in the 14th century. Lithuania and Poland are said to take "Russian (Muscovite) territory to the East" (Mazour, p. 262) when the lands in question were inhabited not by Russians but by the ancestors of modern Ukrainians and Byelorussians. In Roselle (A World History: A Cultural Approach, pp. 330-2), Swedes "occupied", Poles "seized" Russian areas, but Russians merely "obtained territory" on the Baltic coast. For Perry (Man's Unfinished Journey: A World History, p. 421), "The Tsars [in the 15th and 16th centuries] were threatened by Lithuania," a "temporary [sic] creation of the Lithuanian princes" when the exact reverse is true. Indeed, it was this grave danger coming from Muscovy that persuaded the representatives of the Kingdom of Poland and the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, a multi-national state consisting of Lithuanians, Byelorussian, and Ukrainians, to conclude a more perfect federal union by signing the Treaty of Lublin in 1569.

It is utterly outrageous for Perry (p. 421) to refer to Lithuania as a "temporary creation of the Lithuanian princes," and to state that "Poland absorbed the Lithuanian Kingdom (sic) at the time of the Counter-Reformation."

The origin of the Cossacks cannot be traced to the tsars' decision "to permit the establishment of irregular troops, part freebooter, from among the adventurers along the open frontier." Cossacks came into existence without the knowledge and permission of the authorities. Once they came into existence, both Polish-Lithuanian and Muscovite rulers became interested in their military services. Besides, it is necessary to distinguish between Ukrainian Cossacks, who came into existence in the Dnieper Region in the

southeastern part of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth known as the "Ukraina", and the Cossacks, who developed along the southeastern border of Muscovite Russia in the Don River Region. The former are identified with the rise of modern Ukrainian nationalism; the latter were eventually transformed into a well-known part of the Russian armed forces. The pro-Russian bias can also be found in Wallbank (History and Life, The World and Its People, p. 81). Poles are invaders who took "advantage" of Russia's weakness in 1600 while Peter the Great of Russia was simply "successful" and extended Russian boundaries." Russia (Wallbank, p. 382) "became master of the eastern shores of the Baltic" in her "desire for ice free ports." Areas only briefly held by Peter are not conquered but "won back" by Catherine the Great. (Wallbank, p. 388).

In Mazour (p. 351), Turks "conquered" while Russia merely "added much territory" and carried out "acquisition of warm water seaports that were not dominated by other nations." James and Davis (p. 306) justify Russian expansion in the early 18th century at the expense of Sweden by asserting that Swedes "blocked connections between the Russians and countries of the West." Somehow Sweden's identity as a "Western European country" itself was overlooked. Oppressed minorities are discovered by Mazour (p. 355) in 18th-century Poland on the eve of the Partitions, but there is no mention of oppressed non-Russian minorities within the Russian Empire. In covering the 19th century period, the world history texts written by Wallbank, Mazour, and Cooper make no mention of East Central European countries and hardly make any mention of national minorities in the Russian Empire. However, there is some coverage of these groups in textbooks by Roselle and Beers. The few and infrequent references to the history of non-Russian nations before the 20th century are very often not factually true. Prague (Praha), that magnificant Czech city, does not go back merely to the 13th century (James & Davis, p. 331), but rather to the 9th century A.D.

Perry (p. 416) asserts that "Unlike England and France, none of these eastern states [meaning Poland, Hungary, Russia, etc.,] was a nation state in the making." He cites the variety of peoples with many languages and a lack of "clear cut geographic boundaries" as the explanation for this state of affairs. This conclusion cannot be fully accepted. After all, the kingdom of Hungary did have definite and clear cut geographic boundaries. The English created a United Kingdom that was composed of diverse nations, the Scots, Welsh, and Irish. It is true that modern popular nationalism originated in Western Europe, specifically in Revolutionary France, in the late 18th century. But it did not take much time for this ideology to be adopted by East Europeans. The establishment of nation states became the ideal for both Eastern European and Western European nations. But the implementation of that ideal became more of a problem because most East Europeans lost their independence by the 18th century. It is not true (Perry, p. 417) that of all the Slavs, only the Russians managed to create a great state comparable to France or England. What about the great Polish-Lithuanian state that reached its zenith in the 16th and first half of 17th centuries? It certainly held its own with France and England at that time. Roselle should be commended for giving space to cultural matters which most authors ignore. The coverage of Austrian music and Russian literature, art, and science is laudable. But Roselle ignores the Eastern European nations between Austria and Russia. How can you have Glinka without Chopin and Dvorak, Lobachevsky without Bolyar, Turgenev without Sienkiewicz?

RE-EMERGENCE OF INDEPENDENT EAST EUROPEAN STATES IN THE 19TH AND 20TH CENTURIES

Textbook authors must somehow give the students a better understanding of the nature of the traumas which almost every East European nation experienced from the 13th to the 18th centuries. As a consequence, Eastern Europeans societies lost their independence and suffered an abrupt and deep interruption of their normal progress. The Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth (Rzecz Pospolita) was the last East European state to lose its independence as a result of the Partitions in the late 18th century. But Eastern Europeans never gave up their struggle for independence from foreign rule; that remained their first and foremost goal.

The first Eastern European people who succeeded in gaining independence during the 19th century were those who were part of the Ottoman Turkish Empire in southeastern Europe which was a weak and decadent state that could not cope with the national struggles and revolutions. (Serbia in 1805, Rumania in 1856, Bulgaria in 1878, and Albania in 1912 all gained their independence before the Great War.) The political systems that these Eastern European states established were based on Western liberal models (particularly the Belgian monarchical system) and not Russian autocratic models. This is, of course, quite significant and should be stressed.

When textbook authors deal with the period after the first World War, they create the false impression that the new states that began to appear in Europe were largely the result of actions by the allied victors. The Eastern European nations seemed to be passive about their fate. Wood (p. 626) wrote that new nations "were created" by Western Allies "out of lands taken away....from Russia." Wallbank (p. 563) wrote that "The Allies reorganized the land lost by Russia to Germany." The truth is that the East European countries such as Poland, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Latvia, Hungary, Lithuania, and Yugoslavia largely created themselves out of lands that properly belonged to them, rather than to the existing empires. For several years, the Western Allies refused to give de jure recognition and admission to the League of Nations of Latvia, Estonia, and Lithuania, even though the Soviet Union had extended recognition to these Baltic countries. Once again, it is significant to note that these peoples preferred to look for their political models in Western Europe, rather than to totalitarian communist Russia. Eastern Europeans wanted no part of the communist Soviet system. Of course, some of the Eastern European nations, such as the Ukrainians, Byelorussians, and the various Transcaucasian people (Armenians, Georgians, and Azerbaijani) were not very fortunate. In spite of their valiant efforts, they did not succeed in emancipating themselves, but rather were forced to join the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

EASTERN EUROPEANS BETWEEN THE WARS - UNFAIR CRITICISM

Textbook authors tend to be severely critical of the new Eastern European states that came into existence after World War I. There seems to be no understanding and appreciation for the enormous problems that the East Europeans had to face: war devastation and ruin, the Great Depression of the 1930s, totalitarian threats coming from the right (Nazi Germany, Fascist Italy) and the left (Communist Soviet Union), minorities problems, border

RE-EMERGENCE OF INDEPENDENT EAST EUROPEAN STATES IN THE 19TH AND 20TH CENTURIES

Textbook authors must somehow give the students a better understanding of the nature of the traumas which almost every East European nation experienced from the 13th to the 18th centuries. As a consequence, Eastern Europeans societies lost their independence and suffered an abrupt and deep interruption of their normal progress. The Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth (Rzecz Pospolita) was the last East European state to lose its independence as a result of the Partitions in the late 18th century. But Eastern Europeans never gave up their struggle for independence from foreign rule; that remained their first and foremost goal.

The first Eastern European people who succeeded in gaining independence during the 19th century were those who were part of the Ottoman Turkish Empire in southeastern Europe which was a weak and decadent state that could not cope with the national struggles and revolutions. (Serbia in 1805, Rumania in 1856, Bulgaria in 1878, and Albania in 1912 all gained their independence before the Great War.) The political systems that these Eastern European states established were based on Western liberal models (particularly the Belgian monarchical system) and not Russian autocratic models. This is, of course, quite significant and should be stressed.

When textbook authors deal with the period after the first World War, they create the false impression that the new states that began to appear in Europe were largely the result of actions by the allied victors. The Eastern European nations seemed to be passive about their fate. Wood (p. 626) wrote that new nations "were created" by Western Allies "out of lands taken away....from Russia." Wallbank (p. 563) wrote that "The Allies reorganized the land lost by Russia to Germany." The truth is that the East European countries such as Poland, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Latvia, Hungary, Lithuania, and Yugoslavia largely created themselves out of lands that properly belonged to them, rather than to the existing empires. For several years, the Western Allies refused to give de jure recognition and admission to the League of Nations of Latvia, Estonia, and Lithuania, even though the Soviet Union had extended recognition to these Baltic countries. Once again, it is significant to note that these peoples preferred to look for their political models in Western Europe, rather than to totalitarian communist Russia. Eastern Europeans wanted no part of the communist Soviet system. Of course, some of the Eastern European nations, such as the Ukrainians, Byelorussians, and the various Transcaucasian people (Armenians, Georgians, and Azerbaijani) were not very fortunate. In spite of their valiant efforts, they did not succeed in emancipating themselves, but rather were forced to join the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

EASTERN EUROPEANS BETWEEN THE WARS - UNFAIR CRITICISM

Textbook authors tend to be severely critical of the new Eastern European states that came into existence after World War I. There seems to be no understanding and appreciation for the enormous problems that the East Europeans had to face: war devastation and ruin, the Great Depression of the 1930s, totalitarian threats coming from the right (Nazi Germany, Fascist Italy) and the left (Communist Soviet Union), minorities problems, border

disputes, etc. Before they could resolve these problems, World War II came in just two decades. It must be remembered that the victorious Western Allied powers demonstrated little or no political determination and largely abandoned the Eastern European countries to their own devices. The struggles to maintain newly won national independence and security were so intense and required so much energy and resources that many of the political, economic, and social problems were not adequately addressed nor resolved. From hindsight, one can state that it was unwise for many Eastern European leaders to insist on creating "unitary states" dominated by one nation and adopting an unstable French parliamentary system of government. Yet, the social, economic, and especially cultural achievements should be stressed; and it would be wrong to suggest, as some authors do, that there is some justification for the communist takeover of Eastern Europe following World War II and that Eastern European nations are thus better off in communist-governed states. No Eastern European nation freely embraced communist systems of government. Here are some examples of this unfair and unsympathetic treatment of interwar Eastern Europe: James and Davis (p. 335) state that before World War II the great majority of the people (in Hungary) were illiterate peasants. In fact, in the year 1930, only eight percent of the population over six years of age was illiterate. Mazour (p. 673) states that "after World War I, the communist regime of Bela Kun was bitterly opposed by the Hungarian aristocrats." This gives the false impression that other strata of the Hungarian population favored the communist regime. In fact, Bela Kun's short-lived, but bloody regime was opposed by the majority of all social classes in Hungary.

Beers and other textbook authors (Perry, p. 620; Mazour, p. 604) use the term "Polish Corridor" invented by German propagandists, rather than the term "Pomerania" (Pomorze), to identify the narrow strip of land separating East Prussia from the rest of the Germany that was returned to Poland by the Versailles Treaty in 1919. Pomerania was returned to Poland not only because it was inhabited by a Polish population in keeping with the principle of national self-determination, but also to guarantee Poland's access to the Baltic Sea. This was one of the provisions of Wilson's 14 points, which was accepted by Germany as a basis for a peace settlement.

It is unfair to describe Eastern Europeans countries, especially Poland and Czechoslovakia, as undependable allies of France in the 1920s and 1930s. (Mazour, p. 606). It was just the opposite, especially after the Locarno Treaties of 1925 and the remilitarization of the Rhineland in 1936. In 1936, both Poland and Czechoslovakia promised full support if France decided to stop Nazi Germany from marching into the Rhineland. In 1933, Pilsudski's Poland had even suggested to France a preventive war against Nazi Germany. The trend away from western liberal democracy was not confined to Eastern Europe. After all, democracy failed in the Weimar Republic of Germany. It is true that in such countries as Hungary and Poland, model democracies were not developed. But neither Horthy in Hungary nor Pilsudski in Poland established military dictatorships or totalitarian governments. In each country, parliaments with genuine opposition parties functioned. The support of these regimes was not limited to the aristocracy and the military as Mazour (p. 673) suggests.

It is refreshing to find a rare defense of the Treaty of Versailles and other peace treaties signed after World War I since they "helped to release

disputes, etc. Before they could resolve these problems, World War II came in just two decades. It must be remembered that the victorious Western Allied powers demonstrated little or no political determination and largely abandoned the Eastern European countries to their own devices. The struggles to maintain newly won national independence and security were so intense and required so much energy and resources that many of the political, economic, and social problems were not adequately addressed nor resolved. From hindsight, one can state that it was unwise for many Eastern European leaders to insist on creating "unitary states" dominated by one nation and adopting an unstable French parliamentary system of government. Yet, the social, economic, and especially cultural achievements should be stressed; and it would be wrong to suggest, as some authors do, that there is some justification for the communist takeover of Eastern Europe following World War II and that Eastern European nations are thus better off in communist-governed states. No Eastern European nation freely embraced communist systems of government. Here are some examples of this unfair and unsympathetic treatment of interwar Eastern Europe: James and Davis (p. 335) state that before World War II the great majority of the people (in Hungary) were illiterate peasants. In fact, in the year 1930, only eight percent of the population over six years of age was illiterate. Mazour (p. 673) states that "after World War I, the communist regime of Bela Kun was bitterly opposed by the Hungarian aristocrats." This gives the false impression that other strata of the Hungarian population favored the communist regime. In fact, Bela Kun's short-lived, but bloody regime was opposed by the majority of all social classes in Hungary.

Beers and other textbook authors (Perry, p. 620; Mazour, p. 604) use the term "Polish Corridor" invented by German propagandists, rather than the term "Pomerania" (Pomorze), to identify the narrow strip of land separating East Prussia from the rest of the Germany that was returned to Poland by the Versailles Treaty in 1919. Pomerania was returned to Poland not only because it was inhabited by a Polish population in keeping with the principle of national self-determination, but also to guarantee Poland's access to the Baltic Sea. This was one of the provisions of Wilson's 14 points, which was accepted by Germany as a basis for a peace settlement.

It is unfair to describe Eastern Europeans countries, especially Poland and Czechoslovakia, as undependable allies of France in the 1920s and 1930s. (Mazour, p. 606). It was just the opposite, especially after the Locarno Treaties of 1925 and the remilitarization of the Rhineland in 1936. In 1936, both Poland and Czechoslovakia promised full support if France decided to stop Nazi Germany from marching into the Rhineland. In 1933, Pilsudski's Poland had even suggested to France a preventive war against Nazi Germany. The trend away from western liberal democracy was not confined to Eastern Europe. After all, democracy failed in the Weimar Republic of Germany. It is true that in such countries as Hungary and Poland, model democracies were not developed. But neither Horthy in Hungary nor Pilsudski in Poland established military dictatorships or totalitarian governments. In each country, parliaments with genuine opposition parties functioned. The support of these regimes was not limited to the aristocracy and the military as Mazour (p. 673) suggests.

It is refreshing to find a rare defense of the Treaty of Versailles and other peace treaties signed after World War I since they "helped to release

minority groups (Eastern European nations) from the domination of foreign powers" (Daniel Roselle, A World History: A Cultural Approach, p. 584). But it is preposterous for one author, Herbert Gross, to suggest that East European nations are better off with communist systems of government than they were under the "retrogressive non-communist government of the interwar period." He associates communist governments with a "New industrial age in Eastern Europe" that resulted from "carefully planned programs to build up industry in underdeveloped regions." Czechoslovakia is cited as having achieved great industrial strength because of the communist system. (Gross, p. 323). It is known that Czechoslovakia's industrialization must be traced to Bohemia in the Hapsburg period before World War I. In a chart contrasting the communist system with the non-communist system in Western Europe, students are misinformed (Gross, p. 318) that "Communist government exists to protect the interests of the whole society." Furthermore, although individuals cannot compete for profits in a communist system, "all wealth is shared among the people according to their needs." Even communists themselves do not claim such generosity for their system of government at "this stage of history." It is misleading for Danzer and Larson (p. 487) to write that "the countries of Eastern Europe (except for Albania and Yugoslavia) maintain close ties with the Soviet Union." As satellites, they have no choice but to do so. When they had a choice in the interwar period, they shunned contacts with the Soviet Union.

EASTERN EUROPEAN NATIONS AND THE SOVIET UNION

It must be made very clear to students that the non-Russian Eastern European nations cannot be described as "communist countries" or "communist people" (James & Davis, p. 295). They are, instead, communist-ruled countries. As Wood, et al., (page 722) points out , the Soviet Russia, following World War II, imposed its communist system on the Eastern European nations and had thus broken the agreement made at Yalta. The Soviets had no intention of allowing free elections in Eastern Europe. Instead, they planned to build a Soviet communist empire. In 1940, even before the end of World War II, while Stalin cooperated with Hitler after the signing of the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact in 1939, the Soviet Union shamelessly incorporated the Baltic states, Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia, into the Soviet Union, something which the United States government has refused to recognize to this day. This annexation cannot be justified as some textbooks do (Perry, p. 725) that after all, "they had been part of the Russian empire for centuries." The right of nations to self-determination takes precedence over historic claims based on 18th-century Russian conquests. Of course, after World War I the Soviets had conquered the Ukrainian and Byelorussian nations.

When some textbook authors devote chapters to a so-called "Soviet Cultural Region" (e.g., James & Davis, Unit 5), they are really dealing with the Soviet Communist Empire recently created by Stalin. Such textbooks seem to accept the domination of Eastern European countries by the Soviet Union as a historical and even a geographic necessity. This, of course, is not the case. Mazour (p. 775) rightfully points out that the division of Eastern and Western Europe is unnatural. Indeed, after more than four decades of communist rule, the Soviet Union and its satellites have not been able to make communists out of most East European people, as developments have shown in Hungary, Poland, Czechoslovakia, and more recently in the Baltic nations

of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia. Instead, these people constitute the Achilles heal of the Soviet Empire.

The Warsaw Pact is not an exact equivalent to NATO as Danzer in Land and People (p. 487) implies. The Warsaw Pact is not an alliance of free sovereign, independent states, whereas NATO is. The former are, therefore, unreliable partners for the Soviet Union. Perry (p. 752) does a good job explaining that after World War II peoples of Eastern-Central Europe were hostile to the Soviet Union, and there was little communist strength in these countries. "Stalin knew that left to their fate, the people of East Central Europe would turn against the Communist system and the Soviet Union." However, Stalin was determined to satellize these countries because they were supposedly vital for Soviet security. But in fact, strong, ideological, economic, and political reasons were far more important than security considerations.

The Soviet Union, contrary to the suggestions made by some authors like Drummond (p. 342), did not extend much help to Eastern European economies. On the contrary, especially up to 1956, the Soviet Union exploited these countries, as if they were colonies. Even today, for example, Hungary must export its chief raw material bauxite exclusively to the Soviet Union and is not permitted to build an aluminum industry. The Soviet Union, in general, has impeded rather than facilitated the economic growth and development of Eastern European countries. The Stalinist economic pattern, with its emphasis on heavy industry and the collectivization of agriculture, was forced "down the throats" of the Eastern Europeans by the Soviet Union. There was a great resistance to this pattern, especially to collectivization by East European peasant farmers. Yet, many textbooks portray the battle as a "clash between peasant conservatism and the need for scientific farming." Consequently, the defenders of private farms against collectivization efforts are often presented in a negative light (Perry, p. 754; Gross, p. 1329; James & Davis, p. 359). The authors fail to explain that the primary aim of collectivization was not "efficient and scientific farming," but rather the political and social goals of weakening the peasant farmer class and making it more dependent on the Communist regimes. After all, collectivization in the 1930s in the Soviet Union did not result in a more productive, scientific form of farming. Strangely enough James and Davis on page 315 blamed the low productivity of the kolkhoz on the climate, rather than on the system itself.

By and large, most textbooks do note the East European opposition to the communist system and domination by the Soviet Union since adequate coverage is given to the 1956 events in Hungary and Poland and the 1968 events in Czechoslovakia. In some cases, even the 1980-81 Solidarity movement in Poland is covered. However, (James & Davis, p. 334) have identified Alexander Dubcek, rather than General Ludvik Svoboda, as the President of Czechoslovakia in 1968. With rare exception (Cooper, et al., p. 235), the role of the Catholic Church, especially in Poland (e.g., Cardinal Wyszynski) is not given enough attention. The election of a Polish, Slavic Pope in 1978, John Paul II, and the extraordinary reaction to it in Eastern Europe, dramatically underscored the importance of Christianity in the life and culture of East Europeans behind the "Iron Curtain." Authors such as Boorstin in (p. 615) and Wood (p. 729) speculate that the West could not help the Hungarians in 1956 because it refused to risk a third world war. Yet,

Wood (p. 722) points out that Soviet Russia backed down on Iran, Turkey, and Greece in the face of American power and determination.

HISTORY OF SOVIET RUSSIA, 1917-1945

A few textbooks (Wallbank, pp. 560, 568-8, 570-1, 575; Mazour, p. 683-6) convey the mistaken impression that Lenin and his Bolsheviks overthrew the tsar in 1917. Unfortunately, care was not taken to make it clear that there were two revolutions in 1917: (1) The March 1917 Revolution which forced Tsar Nicholas II to abdicate without major Bolshevik participation and (2) The November 1917 Revolution (or coup d'etat) engineered by the Bolsheviks which overthrew the provisional government. This government was based on an elected Duma and was making preparations for democratic elections to a Constituent Assembly. Only the Roselle textbook correctly reported that the Constituent Assembly elected by the people in late November, 1917, was disbanded by the communists in January, 1918, when it refused to accept Soviet power and authority. Socialist revolutionaries received 58% of the vote to the Constituent Assembly and the Bolsheviks received only 25%. The overthrow of the provisional government should be regarded as a great historical tragedy for the Russian people because it aborted a movement toward social democracy.

Textbooks understate or ignore one of the most horrendous tragedies of the 20th century that occurred in the Soviet Union under Stalin's leadership between 1929-1933. The atrocities committed on the Soviet peasantry as a consequence of "dekulakization" and "collectivization" resulted in millions of deaths, rather than "hundreds of thousands of the wealthier peasants," as Mazour indicated (p. 690). In particular, the terror-famine of 1931-33 was inflicted on the Ukrainian peasants not only because they were peasants, but also because they harbored Ukrainian national feelings and constituted the moral and physical foundation of the Ukrainian nation. Seven to nine million Ukrainians perished during the terror famine. Wallbank's (p. 578) treatment of this event is woefully inadequate. Stalin is even given credit for calling "a halt to these brutal methods in 1930. From then on propaganda and economic pressure were used instead." Beers (p. 592) fails to take note that the terror-famine was focused primarily in the Ukraine where the opposition was strongest. He also exaggerates the number of kulaks [prosperous peasants] in the Soviet Union when he wrote "millions of kulaks [instead of ordinary peasant farmers] were executed or sent to forced labor camps in Siberia." However, Beers at least gives a better estimate of the number of Stalin's victims during the collectivization period, when he cited Stalin's admission that "10 million people had died during collectivization."

Roselle (pp. 600-601) merely makes reference to "ruthless and brutal techniques to achieve objectives for the five year plans." But can students get a fair idea of what went on in the Soviet Union in 1928 to 1933 if the textbook author simply writes "Dictatorial methods violated freedom of speech and other democratic rights. Freedom was trampled on by men racing to reach statistical goals." The "Great Terror" or the "Great Purges" of 1936-1938 is not given much better coverage. Students should certainly know that the victims of this crime numbered in the millions and not in the thousands (Roselle, p. 600) although Mazour (p. 691) does estimate that nearly 8 million persons were arrested between 1936-1938 and then either "deported,

imprisoned in forced labor camps, or executed." Wallbank (p. 580), however, does point out that "Hundreds of thousands were shot. Millions of others were sent to forced labor camps, never to be heard from again," because Stalin wanted to be certain that no one could effectively challenge his absolute rule over the Soviet Union.

The Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact (or Hitler-Stalin Pact) of August 23, 1939, is fairly well-covered in the Mazour, Roselle, and Cooper world history textbooks. Wallbank (p. 582), however, completely distorts this event when he suggests that Stalin was forced to change his foreign policy because Britain and France distrusted him and "wanted very much to avoid offending Hitler." The Pact, which included a Secret Protocol (not noted by the author), was a sinister deal between two dictators to divide Eastern Europe between themselves. Stalin's pledge of neutrality allowed Germany to invade Poland and precipitate World War II. The Pact also determined the fate of the Baltic Republics. Wallbank's statement, "But only a few short days later, World War II began," is completely erroneous and misleading. War broke out because of the pact and not in spite the Pact as "but" implies.

HUMAN LOSSES DURING WORLD WAR II

The people of Eastern Europe suffered and died during World War II more than any other people on the face of the globe. Textbooks legitimately do take cognizance of the great human and material losses suffered undeniably by the nations of the Soviet Union, but virtually ignore other East European nations. The Soviet Union has claimed, primarily on the basis of the analysis of 1959 census, that 20 million of its people lost their lives during World War II. This figure is more or less accepted in Wallbank (p. 642), Beers, Danzer (p. 489), Todd and Curti (p. 707), and Boorstin (18 million Russians, p. 578). The figure of 20 million must be carefully scrutinized. It must not be understood as losses which resulted totally in fighting Nazi Germany and her allies. A substantial number of Soviet subjects died fighting against the Soviet regime itself. There were also many undependable Soviet soldiers who were either executed or sent to die in labor camps. In addition, many Soviet citizens managed to escape to the West to live in exile.

A graph in the Beers textbook shows the casualties in World War II suffered by Britain, France, the Soviet Union, Germany, Italy, and Japan. Yet, there are no casualty figures for Eastern European countries like Poland whose substantial armed forces under a Polish government in exile in London continued to fight on the Allied side all during the war in the Middle East, North Africa, and Western Europe. Poland's military and civilian losses were enormous and amounted to 20% of her population (6 million). Her underground army, as well as her armed forces, organized by the Polish government-in-exile in London made valuable contributions to the Allied Cause, while the Warsaw Uprising which started in August, 1944, and continued for 63 days resulted in the total destruction of Warsaw, its capital, and the death of over 200,000 people as Soviet armies watched nearby across the Vistula River. The Soviet regime committed atrocities not only against Poles (e.g., Katyn Forest Massacre, mass deportations to Siberia) but also against Crimean Tatars, Volga Germans, Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians which are not mentioned in the textbooks at all.

Several textbook authors have rightly made its readers aware of the systematic murder of 6 million Jews, mostly from Eastern Europe, carried out by the German Nazi regime, which has been called the Holocaust. But to have a better idea of exact dimension of Nazi crimes against humanity, without denying the uniqueness of the Jewish tragedy, textbook authors should also point out that there were Christian, non-Jewish victims of Nazi crimes. It is estimated that there were about 9 million gentiles who were murdered by the Nazis. Most of them were East Europeans, namely Poles, Russians, Ukrainians, Byelorussians, Serbians, and Gypsies who were considered inferior people. For some reason, authors consistently avoid identifying the victimized East European nations by specific nationality. Beers, without giving any figures, wrote that "Jews were not the only victims....Many others, Slavs, Gypsies, the physically and mentally disabled and political prisoners were also killed." Todd and Curtis (p. 674) referred to "another 6 million, gypsies, political prisoners and prisoners of war--also perished in the camps."

Mazour (p. 279) observed that "Nazis murdered 6 million European Jews. Nearly as many non-Jews, including Slavs, Gypsies, and resistance workers were also murdered." James and Davis (p. 45) wrote, "Jews, Slavs and gypsies, whom Hitler singled out as inferior, were persecuted and sent to concentration camps. Such camps were actually death camps where millions of people were murdered." Only Cooper (p. 232) specifically mentions the Christian Poles as victims of the Holocaust. "Over 3 million Polish Jews died in the death camps established by Hitler's government. Nearly 3 million other Poles were also sent to death camps or as slave labor to Germany."

CUBA, COMMUNISM AND EASTERN EUROPE

Commissioner Roland Alum, a specialist on Ibero-America, found that textbooks allocated little space to Cuba, despite its geographic proximity to the U.S. and its relative importance to contemporary American history. THe few books that did mention Cuba focused primarily on the dramatic "Missile Crisis of 1962" where Cuba is treated more like an object, rather than a subject of history. He detected an anti-Latin bias which implies that Cubans (and by extension other Latin Americans) are "indolent people" incapable of developing democracies for themselves.

Authors like Wood, et al., in America, fail to explain that the Fidel Castro regime in Cuba has produced the most repressive government known in the Americas. In the words of Professor I.L. Horowitz of Rutgers University, post-revolutionary Cuba constitutes a "sheer, autocratic, militaristic, Soviet-style police state." Obviously, this kind of system is not what the Cuban people expected to get after the overthrow of the Batista dictatorship. As Wood, et al., note, to their credit, the Cuban people longed for a representative democracy with economic development. Instead, the new rulers established pacts with the old Communist Pary in Cuba and with the Soviet Union, with disastrous results for the Cuban people.

Boorstin, et al., in A History of the United States, give Castro "credit" for "freeing Cuba from its dependence on the U.S." But the textbook does not clarify Castro's dependence on Soviet Russia today. Nor is sufficient attention given either to Cuba's penetration of the rest of Latin America and

the Carribean since 1959 or to its role as the surrogate of the Soviet Union in Africa. Overall, the inefficacious relationship of Cuba with the Soviet Union is not critically evaluated; nor is much emphasis given to the evident reluctance of the Cuban people to accept this type of relationship, and in some cases to openly express opposition. One clear example of unrest was the Mariel boatlift, when over 1.25% of the island's population fled in a span of a few months in the summer of 1980, adding close to 128,000 Cubans to the one million Cuban community in the United States.

The reality of contemporary Cuba is not reflected adequately in textbooks, that is, that Cubans under a Marxist-Leninist government are worse off than ever before, in spite of many years of sacrifice and deprivations. There is less freedom today in Cuba; and instead of progress, there is regression in the standard of living and the quality of life. In sum, the experiences of Cuban and East European nations are quite similar and ought to be instructive to other people in the world--especially in our Western hemisphere.

MISCELLANEA

It is impossible to enumerate all of the distortions and inaccuracies found by the commission in the textbooks that were evaluated. The following are just a few additional examples:

> Students are informed by Schwartz and O'Connor (p. 91) that "Only the most able people are chosen....to (join) the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. That is why there are only about 17 million members of the Communist party in a total population of 280 million."
>
> "Those guilty of drunkenness, tardiness, laziness, or other forms of social irresponsibility are publicly shamed into conformity in the Soviet Union (Perry, p. 765). If this were the case, Gorbachev would not have had to initiate his war against alcoholism and the "Perestroika" reform.
>
> "Another outlet for Soviet shipping is the Baltic Sea." However, this body of water is partly frozen during much of the year (Schwartz & O'Connor, p. 72).
>
> "The Balkan peninsula is occupied by .....Hungary (sic)" (Wallbank, p. 561).
>
> "Serbians and Bulgarians came to use the Greek alphabet" according to Drummond (p. 334). Of course, it should be the Cyrillic alphabet.

Several textbooks (Mazour, p. 684; Cooper, pp. 213-214; Schwartz & O'Connor, p. 82) insist on identifying the father and founder of Soviet Union as Nikolai Lenin. Of course, it should be Vladimir Ilyich Lenin. One can understand why Soviet historians involved in the "Soviet-American Textbook Project" find this error particularly objectionable.

CONCLUDING OBSERVATIONS

In analyzing the various textbooks mentioned above, the commission is forced to conclude that inadequate and inaccurate coverage is given to the history and culture of Eastern Europe. When some limited coverage is given, its main focus is on Russia. The nations of East Central Europe (that is the countries between Germany and the Soviet Union) and the non-Russian nations in European Soviet Union are ignored and usually considered only as an appendix to Russian history. No one denies the importance of Russia, but what one expects from textbooks is a sense of balance and proportion.

The commission is not advocating giving "equal time" to all the Eastern European countries. It is suggesting, however, that textbook authors and New Jersey educators reassess the importance of all the nations of Eastern Europe and present a truer, more sophisticated, and more complete picture of the history of Europe and the history of western civilization. Professor Piotr Wandycz of Yale University pointed out quite some years ago in his article, "The Treatment of East Central Europe in History Textbooks" (American Slavic and East European Review, December, 1957) that "Western Slavs, Magyars, Rumanians, Greeks, Southern Slavs, Albanians, Baltic nations - these peoples all belong to the European family of nations, and without understanding their history, the student cannot help but fail to grasp many of the most signal developments of European history." More recently, Professors Daniel Chirot of University of Washington and Kenneth Jowith of University of California at Berkeley wrote in the first issue of East European Politics and Societies, "We do not view East Europe as a kind of side show whose primary importance lies in its strategic value to the U.S.S.R. or as an area of interest because its problems might be exploited by the United States as part of its global competition with the Soviet Union. Rather, because of its historical experience, the diversity of its cultural tradition, and its vulnerability to big power interference, Eastern Europe has had and will continue to have a unique creative role in producing ideas and experimental solutions for solving the major problems of the modern world."

V. SPECIAL EVENTS AND ACTIVITIES

The commission organized a high level "Conference on East European Studies in American Education" on April 15, 1986, at Rutgers University, Busch Campus, Piscataway, New Jersey. It was co-sponsored by the New Jersey Council for the Social Studies. Two of the council's representatives, Joseph Kovacs and Walter Dabrowski, chaired panels. Nearly 200 persons, most of whom were secondary school teachers and administrators from throughout the State of New Jersey, attended. There were also representatives from the East European-American and Cuban-American ethnic communities of New Jersey; particularly from their cultural and educational organizations. Many of these institutions exhibited publications dealing with the history and culture of Eastern Europe during the conference.

Governor Thomas H. Kean underscored the importance of the conference by his presence. At the opening session, Governor Kean spoke eloquently about the signficance of Eastern European history and culture. His complete remarks

are appended to this report (Appendix 5). The opening session was also addressed by Dr. Kenneth W. Wheeler, Provost of Rutgers University, Dr. Ivan Volgyes, representative of the American Association for the Advancement of Slavic Studies (AAASS), and Dr. Tonu Parming, chairman of the Soviet and East European studies at the U.S. Department of State, Foreign Service Institute.

The luncheon speaker was Gary L. Bauer, Under Secretary of Education from the U.S. Department of Education in Washington, D.C.

The program of the conference, organized and coordinated by Dr. Gromada and appended to this report (Appendix 6), shows that the leading scholars in the field of East European Studies participated. Presenters and panelists were invited from Yale University, Princeton University, Rutgers University, Columbia University, University of Maryland, Vanderbilt University, and SUNY at Binghamton. Textbook publishers were represented by Dr. B. Ann Wright, executive editor of the social studies division at Prentice Hall.

The thrust of the conference was not to point out inadequacies in the school's curricula, but rather to assist teachers who want to improve existing courses on world history, Modern European History, American History, and social studies courses, as well as literature and art courses, by introducing and integrating East European topics and issues. A program evaluation form was sent out to all participants. The respondents to this questionnaire rated the conference as excellent.

The deliberations of most of the panels were taped by the technical staff of Rutgers University. These topics were not transcribed because of lack of funds, but they have been placed under the care of Dr. Francis A. Baran, who was in charge of the local arrangements at the Busch Campus of Rutgers University. There is no doubt that the conference was a great success. It received very good coverage before and after the event in the various daily and weekly newspapers in the state. In addition, the conference was well-covered in the ethnic press throughout the country. Educators, as well as the general public in New Jersey, were made aware of the work of the commission.

There is little doubt that the commission benefited a great deal from the thoughtful discussions that took place on April 15, 1986.

On November 14, 1987, the commission held a special meeting for leaders of the various East European ethnic groups in the state of New Jersey, at the New Jersey State Library, at 185 West State Street, Trenton, New Jersey. The meeting, which was by invitation only, was attended by nearly 50 persons.

The main objective of the meeting was to report to community leaders progress that was being made by the commission and to get some feedback from the people who were most directly interested in its work. The dialogue that took place between the commission members and the ethnic community leaders proved to be very fruitful and helpful. The commission was reassured by this interaction that it was on the right track and its work was being understood and appreciated. The November 14, 1987, meeting was well-reported in the ethnic press of New Jersey.

VI. RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE GOVERNOR'S COMMISSION OF EASTERN EUROPEAN AND CAPTIVE NATION HISTORY

RECOMMENDATION I

The commission recommends that the Governor and State legislature establish and adequately fund a permanent body which would direct and monitor the implementation of recommendations found in this report.

RECOMMENDATION II

The commission recommends that, with the help of the Department of Education, the commission's report be given the widest possible distribution to superintendents, principals, boards of education, schools of education in colleges and universities, textbook publishers, professional teachers' associations, organizations of parents, ethnic organizations, and interested community groups. In addition, the commission recommends that the New Jersey Ethnic Advisory Council and Office of Ethnic Affairs in the New Jersey Department of State be urged to assist in the dissemination of this report.

RECOMMENDATION III

The commission recommends that conferences be held (one in Northern New Jersey and one in Southern New Jersey) under the auspices of the Department of Education and an interested college or university for the purpose of informing educational leaders about the findings made in this report.

RECOMMENDATION IV

The commission recommends that the Department of Education help create several pilot programs in interested school districts. These pilot programs should be designed to effectively integrate East European topics and themes into the curriculum, e.g., in World History and World Geography courses. Members of this commission and other experts in the field should be consulted to organize such pilot programs and later to evaluate them.

RECOMMENDATION V

The commission recommends that the Department of Education include in its guidelines for the newly mandated course on World History/World Cultures a statement pointing out the importance of the East European region and the need to give it adequate attention. In addition, the guidelines should encourage the comparative studies of communist-dominated countries in Eastern Europe and Latin America.

RECOMMENDATION VI

The commission recommends that the Department of Education publish in sufficient quantities an "Annotated Listing of Educational Materials on Eastern Europe" and a "Directory of Scholars and other experts in the field of East European Studies," based on the commission's work and findings. These publications should be made available to school districts, classroom teachers, curriculum coordinators, and public libraries.

RECOMMENDATION VII

The commission recommends that the Department of Education and the Department of Higher Education be urged to make grants available to institutions of higher learning and professional educational organizations for the purpose of developing curriculum materials on East European Studies. Grants should also be given to organize workshops, summer institutes, seminars, and courses designed to enrich and retrain school teachers.

RECOMMENDATION VIII

The commission recommends that the professional academic organizations such as the American Association for the Advancement of Slavic Studies (AAASS) based at Stanford University, The American Historical Association (AHA) in Washington, D.C., as well as universities and colleges with strong East European Study Centers and Ethnic East European Academic institutions throughout the United States, be provided with this report and urged to use their resources for the development of study guides, units, and audio-visual materials on Eastern Europe that can be useful to the classroom teacher.

RECOMMENDATION IX

The commission recommends that school libraries, as well as public libraries, be urged to develop a "core" library on Eastern Europe based on the "Annotated Listing" mentioned above.

RECOMMENDATION X

The commission recommends that the Department of Education be directed to establish an "Eastern European Studies Learning Resource Center" at a location such as the State Library in Trenton or Alexander Library at Rutgers University in New Brunswick.

RECOMMENDATION XI

The commission recommends that schools of education and departments of education in the colleges and universities of New Jersey be urged to provide teacher training that would give sufficient attention to the history and culture of Eastern Europe.

RECOMMENDATION XII

The commission recommends that scholars in the field of East European studies at New Jersey's colleges and universities be encouraged to form a council tht would aim to advance effectively the study of Eastern Europe in the schools of New Jersey.

APPENDIX 1

STATE OF NEW JERSEY
Executive Department

EXECUTIVE ORDER NO. 69

WHEREAS, the history of the people of Eastern Europe, of various nationalities existing within the Soviet Union, and other captive nations existing under the oppression of the Soviet Union, is an integral part of our public school curriculum; and

WHEREAS, representatives of the people of Eastern Europe, various nationalities existing within the Soviet Union, and other captive nations existing under the oppression of the Soviet Union, have indicated that their history as presented in public school curriculums is often inaccurate and misleading; and

WHEREAS, it is desirous and beneficial to educate our children about the true and accurate historical events concerning the people of Eastern Europe, various nationalities existing within the Soviet Union, and other captive nations existing under the oppression of the Soviet Union; and

WHEREAS, a comprehensive study of the history of the people of Eastern Europe, various nationalities existing within the Soviet Union, and other captive nations existing under the oppression of the Soviet Union, conducted by knowledgeable members of these ethnic groups could ensure that this history is presented accurately in public school curriculums.

NOW, THEREFORE, I, THOMAS H. KEAN, Governor of the State of New Jersey by virtue of the authority vested in me by the Constitution and laws of this State do hereby ORDER AND DIRECT that:

1. There is hereby created a Governor's Commission on Eastern European and Captive Nation History.

2. The Commission shall consist of no more than twenty members. The members of the Commission shall be the Commissioner of Education or his designee; the Director of the Office of Ethnic Affairs within the Department of State or his designee and eighteen public members to be appointed by the Governor. The public members to be appointed shall be representatives of the various ethnic groups of Eastern Europe, nationalities existing within the Soviet Union, and other captive nations existing under the oppression of the Soviet Union as well as eminent historians and educators who have distinguished records of knowledge and involvement concerning the history and culture of their respective ethnic group.

3. The Governor shall designate a Chairperson and Vice Chairperson of the Commission from among the public members of the Commission. The Chairperson, Vice Chairperson and public members shall serve at the pleasure of the Governor.

4. Commission vacancies shall be filled by the Governor for the remainder of the unexpired term.

5. It shall be the duty of the Governor's Commission on Eastern European and Captive National History to conduct a thorough study of public school curriculum, including textbooks and all other pertinent materials, dealing with the history of the people of Eastern Europe, various nationalities existing within the Soviet Union, and other captive nations existing under the oppression of the Soviet Union, and to examine such materials for veracity and historical accuracy. In the course of its study, the Commission shall determine whether the history of these people is fairly and accurately presented in our public schools and their curriculum.

6. The Commission is authorized to call upon the Department of Education to supply such data, program reports, and other information as it deems necessary to discharge its responsibilities under this Order. The Department of Education is authorized and directed, to the extent not inconsistent with law, to cooperate with the Commission and to furnish it with such information and assistance as is necessary to accomplish the purpose of this Order and the Commission.

7. The Commission shall submit a report of its findings to the Governor and to the State Board of Education on or before January 1, 1986, accompanying the report with any recommendations it deems appropriate. The Commission may issue interim reports concerning its study as it shall determine.

8. The report of the Commission shall be made available to all disseminators of educational materials.

9. This Order shall take effect immediately.

GIVEN, under my hand and seal this 10th day of April in the year of our Lord, one thousand nine hundred and eighty four and of the Independence of the United States the two hundred and eighth.

/s/ Thomas H. Kean
GOVERNOR

[seal]

Attest:

/s/ W. Gary Edwards
Chief Counsel

APPENDIX 2

AAASS

American Association for the Advancement of Slavic Studies

128 Encina Commons Stanford University, Stanford, California 94305 (415) 497-9668

12 October 1984

Dr. Thaddeus V. Gromada
Secretary General
Polish Institute of Arts & Sciences
of America, Inc.
59 East 66th St.
New York, NY 10021

Dear Dr. Gromada:

Thank you for agreeing to meet with our Board of Directors. I write to confirm the time and place. The Board meeting will be in Room 2106 at the Vista International Hotel on November 2, 1984. We will expect you to join us from 3:30 to 4:30 for a discussion of East European studies in the public schools.

The AAASS is very interested in the New Jersey Governor's Study Commission on the History of East European Nations. We look to you to learn more about the Commission's work, and hope to discuss how it might serve as a model nationwide to help expand and improve upon East European studies in the U.S. public educational system.

As you are well aware, there has been mounting concern throughout the country about the inadequacy of such studies and about the implications of this situation in terms of our capacity for international understanding, and of our national interests. The AAASS shares this concern and hopes to work with a number of individuals, organizations, and institutions in addressing the problem. We will be joined at the Board meeting for this discussion by the head of the Kennan Institute from Washington D.C., the chair of the Joint Committee for East European Studies, and a number of other experts.

We look forward to seeing and hearing from you there.

Sincerely,

Dorothy Atkinson

(Dr.) Dorothy Atkinson
Executive Director

DA:cp

APPENDIX 3

A list of the seventeen social studies textbooks most widely used as reported in the 1985 survey.

World History Textbooks

1. Beers, B. (1984). World History: Patterns of Civilization. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

2. Mazour, A., & Peoples, J.M. (1975). Men and Nations: A World History. New York: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich.

3. Perry, M. (1978). Man's Unfinished Journey: A World History. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin Co.

4. Roselle, D. (1976). A World History: A Cultural Approach. Lexington, MA: Ginn & Co.

5. Wallbank, T. W.; Shrier, A.; Maier, D.; & Guttierrez-Smith, P. (1984). History and Life: The World and Its People. Glenview, IL: Scott Foresman & Co.

World Geography Textbooks

6. Cooper, K., et al. (1982). The World and Its People. Morristown, NJ: Silver Burdett.

7. Danzer, G. A., & Larson, A. J. (1983). Land and People: A World Geography. Glenview, IL: Scott Foresman & Co.

8. Drummond, D., & Drummond, R. (1983). People on Earth: A World Geography. Glenview, IL: Scott Foresman & Co.

9. Gross, H. H. (1983). World Geography. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

10. James, P. E., & Davis, N. (1985). World Geography. New York: MacMillan Publishing Co.

11. Schwartz, M., & O'Connor, J.R. (1983). The New Exploring the Non-Western World. New York: Globe Co.

American History Textbooks

12. Bailey, T. A., & Kennedy, D. M. (1979). The American Pageant. Lexington, MA: D.C. Heath & Co.

13. Boorstin, D. J., & Kelley, B. M. (1981). A History of the United States. Lexington, MA: Ginn & Co.

14. Bragdon, H., & McCutchen, S. P. (1981). A History of a Free People. New York: MacMillan Publishing Co.

15. Davidson, J. W., & Lytle, M. H. (1984). The United States: A History of the Republic. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

16. Todd, L. P., & Curti, M. (1982). Rise of the American Nation Heritage Edition. New York: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich.

17. Wood, L. C., Gabriel, R. H., & Biller, E. L. (1984). America: Its People and Values. New York: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich.

RS/lp:1/8067j

APPENDIX 4

GOVERNOR'S COMMISSION ON EASTERN EUROPEAN AND CAPTIVE NATIONS HISTORY

QUESTIONNAIRE ON EAST EUROPEAN STUDIES

COUNTY _____

SCHOOL DISTRICT _____

NAME OF SCHOOL _____

CHIEF SCHOOL ADMINISTRATOR _____

MAILING ADDRESS: _____

_____

_____

TELEPHONE NO. _____
(Area Code)

1. Does your district have any provisions in its curriculum for studies in Eastern European history and/or culture?

   Eastern European History Yes _____ No _____

   Eastern European Culture Yes _____ No _____

(Please Note: For the purpose of this questionnaire, Eastern Europe is defined as Russia and those countries that are dominated by her directly or indirectly in Europe and/or have communist governments. Those countries include Albania, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Byelorussia, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Georgia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Moldavia, Poland, Rumania, Ukraine and Yugoslavia.)

If your response is no, skip to #8.

2. At the secondary level, is Eastern European Studies treated in a separate course or as a unit in an existing course (check one)?

   Course _____ Unit _____

   If course, give title of course: _____

3. In the matrix below, check the subject area and the grade where instruction in East European studies takes place.

Subject Area	Grade						
	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Social Studies							
World History							
European History							
Geography							
American History							
English/Literature							
Art							
Music							
Foreign Language (Specify)							
Other (Specify)							

4. Please indicate how much attention is given to individual Eastern European countries in your curriculum.
   A.) Mark + next to the country(ies) on the list below that receive(s) a great deal of attention;
   B.) Mark ✓ next to the country(ies) on the list below that receive(s) some attention;
   C.) Mark ○ next to the country(ies) that receive(s) no attention.

_____ Albania	_____ Czechoslovakia	_____ Latvia	_____ Rumania
_____ Armenia	_____ Estonia	_____ Lithuania	_____ Russia
_____ Azerbaijan	_____ Georgia	_____ Moldavia	_____ Ukraine
_____ Byelorussia	_____ Hungary	_____ Poland	_____ Yugoslavia
_____ Bulgaria			

5. In American History courses, how much attention is given to mass immigration from Eastern Europe and the contributions of Americans of Eastern European ancestries to American culture?

   _____ Substantial _____ Adequate _____ Little _____ None

6. In view of the current emphasis on global studies and possible changes in history and social studies course requirements for high school graduation, is your school/district planning to introduce a new unit or course(s) on Eastern European and Captive Nations history?

   Yes _____ No _____

   If your answer is yes, please indicate the nature of the changes contemplated.

   _____

7. In order to implement East European studies in the future would you desire assistance or information?

   Yes _____ No _____

8. If your answer is yes to #7, please indicate what forms of assistance would be most useful and desirable?
   _____ Consultants
   _____ Inservice Training
   _____ Curriculum Guidelines
   _____ Speakers
   _____ Clearing House Service from State Department of Education
   _____ Other (Specify)

9. Please provide any comments you may have on this survey.

Please return this questionnaire by May 1, 1987 to: *Dr. Thaddeus V. Gromada, Chairman, Commission of Eastern European and Captive Nations History, c/o Jersey City State College, Department of History, Jersey City, N.J. 07305.*

APPENDIX 5

REMARKS OF GOVERNOR THOMAS H. KEAN
EASTERN EUROPEAN STUDIES CONFERENCE
BUSCH CAMPUS, RUTGERS UNIVERSITY
PISCATAWAY, NEW JERSEY

TUESDAY, APRIL 15, 1986

I want to give a warm New Jersey welcome to our many distinguished guests. It is an honor to share a podium with scholars of such high reputation. We gather here today to talk about history. But I think our distinguished guests might agree that history, like most great pursuits, has not always enjoyed unalloyed popularity. To some, it has been downright foolish.

To the sardonic wit, Ambrose Pierce, history was, "an account, mostly false, of events, mostly unimportant, which are brought about by rulers, mostly knaves, and soldiers, mostly fools." To the Earl of Chesterfield, it was, "nothing more than a confused heap of facts." "A pack of tricks which we play upon the dead," smirked Voltaire'. And Henry Ford, of course, called it, "more or less bunk," though we now know it was really tradition he had a beef with.

With proper deference to the sagacity and wisdom of these four men, I say with ardor that they are simply all wet.

What is the true meaning and value of history? For an answer, I reach all the way back to Rome, and to Cicero, who said simply:

> "History is the evidence of time, the light of truth, the life of memory, the herald of antiquity" -- the only pursuit of man--he said--which is committed to immortality."

That's quite a compliment. Who says the Romans weren't the most enlightened people?

History is a noble pursuit, which should occupy the attention of all of us--not just scholars and people with letters after their name--but everyone--from bus drivers and computer operators to the nice woman who takes the change up on the Turnpike. We all need to discover who we <u>were</u>, so that we can know who we <u>are</u>--today.

But there is a problem. The problem is that too often the "Light of Truth" that Cicero praised becomes a little dim. Too often that light is blocked, by ignorance, laziness or apathy. That is why this Commission and this conference is so important. As the scholars here know so well, the history of Eastern Europe is dynamic, exciting, and often surprising. It is a story of a diverse people struggling for freedom amidst the swirling currents of tyranny and oppression. It is a story that deserves to be told.

Unfortunately, the great majority of Americans view Eastern Europe as a monolith--a solid, drab and foreboding part of the communist world. Here in

New Jersey, we are out to change that perception and to let the light of truth shine through. The Eastern European Commission is the tool we are using.

History has meant a great deal to my development--it is why I take pleasure in seeing this conference held here. Something else means a lot to me--that is our children. The Eastern European Commission--the only one of its kind in the country--is giving New Jersey children a chance at something which frankly a lot of us adults didn't have. By that I mean a fair and accurate account of the history of a part of this world on which so much human drama has been staged. That's vitally important to the more than one million New Jerseyans of Eastern European descent. And its equally important to all of us who care about truth, and who care about freedom.

Since I am on the topic, I will confess that not only do I love history, I have a favorite historian: his name is Winston Churchill. One afternoon in the House of Commons, Churchill, the back bencher, was attacking a certain aspect of government policy. Looking at Stanley Baldwin, who was then prime minister, Churchill declared, "History will show that the right honorable gentleman was wrong on this matter." Baldwin scoffed at the assertion and asked how the Honorable Mr. Churchill could know what history would think. Churchill replied, I know, because I'm going to write it."

I want to thank everyone in the commission for following Mr. Churchill's lead and realizing that <u>today</u> we can have a hand in determining whether our children will know the truth about the world tomorrow.

Thank you very much.

RS/lp:1/8068j

APPENDIX 6

CONFERENCE ON EAST EUROPEAN STUDIES

IN AMERICAN EDUCATION

Sponsored By

THE GOVERNOR'S COMMISSION ON EAST EUROPEAN AND CAPTIVE NATION's HISTORY

Co-sponsored By

THE NEW JERSEY COUNCIL FOR THE SOCIAL STUDIES

APRIL 15, 1986

Busch Campus Center, Rutgers University, Piscataway, N.J.

. . . . . .

9:00-10:00 A.M. Lounge Area — Registration and Coffee

10:00-11:00 A.M. Multipurpose Room — Opening Session

Opening Remarks: Dr. Thaddeus V. Gromada, Chairman, Governor's Commission on East European and Captive Nation's History; Professor, Jersey City State College

Greetings: Dr. Kenneth W. Wheeler, Provost, Rutgers University, New Brunswick Area Campuses

Remarks: The Honorable Thomas H. Kean, Governor of New Jersey

Address: Dr. Ivan Volgyes, Visiting Distinguished Professor of Political Science, Rutgers University, Camden; American Association for the Advancement of Slavic Studies

Address: Dr. Tonu Parming, Chairman, Soviet and East European Studies, Foreign Service Institute, U.S. Department of State

11:00 A.M.-12:30 P.M. Concurrent Panels

Room 120 ABC — Panel A: Treatment of East Europeans in History and Social Studies Textbooks

Chair: Adam Scrupski, Rutgers University, New Brunswick

Panelists: Francis Baran, Assistant Director, Research and Sponsored Programs, Rutgers University
Bohdan Vitvicky, Author and Attorney at Law, South Orange, New Jersey
Rein Taagepera, University of California, Irvine
B'Ann Wright, Executive Editor of Social Studies, Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey

Room 122 ABC

Panel B: Teaching About Contemporary Cuba and Eastern Europe:Parallels and Connections

Chair: Roland Alum, John Jay College, CUNY and New Jersey Department of Commerce and Economic Development

Panelists: Angela Aguirre, William Paterson College of New Jersey
Ileana Fuentes-Perez, Rutgers University
Roland Alum

12:30-1:30 P.M.
Multipurpose Room

Luncheon

Speaker: The Honorable Gary L. Bauer, Under Secretary of Education, U.S. Department of Education

1:30-3:00 P.M.

Concurrent Panels

Room 120 ABC

Panel C: Integrating East European Topics/Issues Into Existing World History and Modern European History Courses

Chair: Joseph Held, Associate Dean, Rutgers University, Camden

Panelists: Alex N. Dragnich, Vanderbilt University (emeritus)
Taras Hunczak, Rutgers University, Newark
Piotr S. Wandycz, Yale University

Room 122 ABC

Panel D: Integrating East European Topics/Issues Into Existing American History and Social Studies Courses

Chair: Joseph Kovacs, President, New Jersey Council for the Social Studies

Panelists: James Mace, Executive Director, National Advisory Commission on the Ukrainian Famine of 1933
Tonu Parming, Foreign Service Institute, Department of State, University of Maryland
Ivan Volgyes, Visiting Professor, Rutgers University, Camden; University of Nebraska

3:00-4:30 P.M.
Room 120 ABC

Panel E: Integrating East European Topics/Issues into Existing Literature and Arts Courses

Chair: Walter Dabrowski, Curriculum Supervisor, Pemberton Township High School

Panelists: Harold Segel, Director, Institute on East Central Europe, Columbia University
Charles E. Townsend, Princeton University
Otto Ulc, State University of New York, Binghamton

. . . . . .

Conference Chairman: Dr. T.V. Gromada; Conference Co-Chairman: Dr. F.A. Baran

Governor's Commission on Eastern European and Captive Nation's History: Thomas H. Kean Governor; Saul Cooperman, Commissioner of Education, Thaddeus V. Gromada, Chairman, Randolph Schaeffer, Secretary. Members: Roland Alum, Francis A. Baran, Sol Chaneles, Laszlo Feketekuty, Janis Gaigulis, Vitaut Kipel, Alexander Krenicki, Arno Liivak, Dimitri Dvoichenko-Markov, Daniel Marchisin, Zenon Onufryk, Janet S. Pollak, Iskar Shumanov, Jack J. Stukas, and T. Robert Zochowski